EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE SHIPBUILDING TRADE AGREEMENT ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1995

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce, together with my colleagues Mr. GIBBONS and Ms. DUNN, the Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act. This bill implements the Shipbuilding Agreement signed December 21, 1994, by key shipbuilding nations after 5 years of negotiation under the auspices of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. I congratulate the administration for negotiating this historic agreement which applies to the construction and repair of self-propelled seagoing vessels of 100 gross tons and above and covers approximately 80 percent of the ships engaged in global shipping.

The agreement is scheduled to enter into force 30 days after all signatories deposit instruments of ratification, acceptance, or approval. In the interim, the signatories are in the process of formal ratification. In the United States, legislation must be enacted by Congress to bring U.S. law into compliance with the agreement.

I believe that it is important to implement this agreement as soon as possible because it should help achieve an international environment that gives the U.S. shipbuilding industry the best chance to compete in world markets that are not distorted through subsidization. The agreement will open up trade in shipbuilding by eliminating distortive government subsidies granted either directly to shipbuilders or indirectly through ship operators. In addition, the agreement contains an injurious pricing code to prevent dumping in the shipbuilding industry and includes a comprehensive discipline in Government financing for exports and domestic ship sales as well as a dispute settlement mechanism. I believe that the hearing held by the Trade Subcommittee in July highlighted the benefits that implementation of this agreement will bring.

The bill uses the antidumping remedies of Title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, as the model for the provisions applicable to shipbuilding, revised only where necessary to take into account differences between the agreement and the WTO and differences due to the unique nature of vessels. However, although we applied Title VII without change wherever possible, we will review the entire antidumping scheme as it applies to merchandise in general and shipbuilding in particular at some later time.

The Trade Subcommittee will mark up this legislation on Wednesday, December 13. I hope that after that point, the full Committee on Ways and Means will take up the bill as quickly as possible. Unfortunately, the press of other business has prevented us from considering an implementing bill sooner. However, my commitment to this legislation is solid. I am confident that our trading partners do not doubt our resolve and understand that we will do our best to consider the legislation promptly so that we may implement the agreement as soon in 1996 as possible.

PROPOSED SALE OF ARMY TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEM TO TURKEY

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1995, the Clinton administration notified the Congress of its proposal to sell 120 Army Tactical Missile Systems [ATACMS], valued at $132 million, to the Government of Turkey. The Congress has 15 days to review this proposed sale to Turkey, a NATO ally.

Because of many concerns in the Congress about human rights in Turkey, I asked the Department of State to write to me with respect to this weapons system, and whether any human rights issues are raised by this proposed sale. The text of the letter from the Department of State follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, November 17, 1995.

Hon. LEE HAMILTON,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: I am pleased to respond to your request for further information regarding the Administration's intention to transfer 120 Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) missiles to Turkey.

We believe this defensive system is appropriate to the threats faced by Turkey. In particular, with a range of 165 kilometers, ATACMS is designed and tested to be effective against high value targets deep behind the battlefield, including deployed ballistic missile launch sites, surface-to-air missiles and command and control units.

The missile can be launched from the Multiple Launch Rocket System, of which the Turks already possess twelve. This compatibility makes the ATACMs an ideal system for meeting Turkish defense needs. Moreover, the transfer meets NATO defense requirements and it supported by the Commanders-in-Chief of the European Command and Central Command and offers protection against Iran, Iraq, and Syria, all of which have missiles capable of striking Turkey.

We are aware of your concern that arms transfers be used for the uses intended by the U.S. government as stipulated in the Arms Export Control Act and other relevant statutes. We share your concern and wish to emphasize that this is not a weapon likely to be used in the commission of human rights abuses.

First, the high cost of the system, $750,000 per missile, make it highly impractical as a counter-insurgency or anti-personnel weapon. Second, it is designed and optimized as an anti-material weapon; the munitions it carries are designed to pierce electronic equipment and other lightly shielded materiel. Third, in view of the characteristics of the missile, the United States has the ability to monitor the use of the system. Fourth, the distinctive debris and damage pattern it produces make it possible to obtain physical evidence that it has been used.

The use of this system against insurgents does not make financial or military sense and its use could be confirmed by observation and physical evidence. You should also know that, unlike some other sub-munitions weapons it has a very low ''dud'' rate (4 per cent or less). Therefore, if it is used in wartime, the risk to civilians from unexploded munitions will be very low.

We need to ensure the Turks do not question our security relationship with them. While we have in fact been exceptionally thoughtful in our transfers, it is important now to demonstrate we are a reliable ally and that Turkey's legitimate defense needs will be met.

Our Embassy in Ankara has commented that it is particularly important to go forward with the ATACM sale now to reassure Ankara about the reliability of our security relationship.

I hope we have been responsive to your concerns. Please do not hesitate to contact me if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,
Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs.

GEORGE LESLIE McCULLEN

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 11, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 11, 1995, George Leslie McCullen was laid to rest. George was an extraordinarily good and honorable man, a valued friend, and a strong ally.

There is a sweet irony that George was buried on Veterans' Day, the day our Nation sets aside to say ''thank you'' to those who have served in our Armed Forces. As a veteran of the Korean conflict, George earned our thanks. His service to country did not end, however, when George completed military service. Until his recent retirement, George was employed by the Virginia Department of Education, veterans education. In this capacity, he and his staff were responsible for ensuring that only education programs of the finest quality were approved for veterans using their GI bill benefits. Veteran students receive a superior education in the State of Virginia because of George McCullen's dedication to excellence and commitment to learning.

I noted earlier that George was a strong ally. I first met him during the early days of the battle for the new GI bill. At that time, George was legislative director for the National Association of State Approving Agencies [NASAA], a position he held from 1983 to 1990. Although George worked in Richmond, he never hesitated to make the drive to Washington to participate in one of our many strategy sessions. His suggestions for action were always excellent, and his dedication was a major factor in our ultimate success—the implementation of the new GI bill on July 1, 1985. George