

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 9, 1983

The House met at 10 a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, as we observe and experience the uncertainties of life always about us, we pray for strength greater than our own. We admit that by ourselves we do not understand the trials and anxieties of daily living, nor do we have faith enough to understand all mysteries or knowledge. Grant us the power of Your love, a love sufficient to give peace to every troubled soul and joy and thanksgiving to all Your creation. Bless us O Lord, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 32, answered "present" 3, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—363

Ackerman	Bethune	Broyhill
Addabbo	Bevill	Bryant
Akaka	Biaggi	Burton
Albosta	Billrakis	Byron
Alexander	Billey	Campbell
Anderson	Boehlert	Carney
Andrews (NC)	Boggs	Carper
Andrews (TX)	Boland	Carr
Annunzio	Boner	Chandler
Anthony	Bonior	Chappelle
Archer	Bonker	Chapple
Aspin	Borski	Clarke
Barnard	Bosco	Clinger
Barnes	Boucher	Coats
Bartlett	Boxer	Coelho
Bates	Breaux	Coleman (MO)
Bedell	Britt	Coleman (TX)
Bennett	Brooks	Collins
Bereuter	Broomfield	Conte
Berman	Brown (CA)	Cooper

Corcoran	Hughes	Murtha
Courter	Hutto	Myers
Coyne	Hyde	Natcher
Craig	Ireland	Neal
Crane, Daniel	Jenkins	Nelson
Crane, Philip	Johnson	Nichols
D'Amours	Jones (OK)	Nielson
Daniel	Jones (TN)	Nowak
Daschle	Kaptur	O'Brien
Daub	Kasich	Oakar
Davis	Kastenmeier	Obey
de la Garza	Kazen	Olin
Dellums	Kemp	Ortiz
Derrick	Kennelly	Oxley
DeWine	Kildeer	Packard
Dicks	Kindness	Panetta
Dingell	Kostmayer	Parris
Donnelly	Kramer	Pashayan
Dorgan	LaFalce	Patman
Dowdy	Lagomarsino	Patterson
Downey	Lantos	Paul
Dreier	Latta	Pease
Duncan	Leach	Penny
Dwyer	Leath	Pepper
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Perkins
Early	Leland	Petri
Eckart	Lent	Pickle
Edwards (AL)	Levin	Porter
Edwards (CA)	Levine	Price
Edwards (OK)	Levitas	Pritchard
English	Lewis (CA)	Pursell
Erdreich	Lewis (FL)	Quillen
Erlenborn	Lipinski	Rahall
Evans (IL)	Livingston	Rangel
Fascell	Loeffler	Ray
Fazio	Long (LA)	Regula
Feighan	Long (MD)	Reid
Ferraro	Lott	Richardson
Fiedler	Lowery (CA)	Ridge
Fields	Lowry (WA)	Rinaldo
Fish	Lujan	Ritter
Flippo	Luken	Rodino
Florio	Lundine	Roe
Foglietta	Lungren	Rogers
Foley	Mack	Roth
Ford (MI)	MacKay	Roukema
Ford (TN)	Madigan	Rowland
Fowler	Markey	Roybal
Frank	Marlenee	Rudd
Franklin	Marriott	Russo
Frost	Martin (IL)	Savage
Gaydos	Martin (NC)	Sawyer
Gekas	Martin (NY)	Schaefer
Gephardt	Matsui	Scheuer
Gibbons	Mavroules	Schneider
Gilman	Mazzoli	Schulze
Gingrich	McCain	Schumer
Glickman	McCandless	Seiberling
Gonzalez	McCloskey	Sensenbrenner
Gore	McCollum	Shannon
Gradison	McCurdy	Sharp
Gray	McDade	Shaw
Green	McDonald	Shelby
Guarini	McEwen	Shumway
Gunderson	McGrath	Shuster
Hall (IN)	McHugh	Sikorski
Hall (OH)	McKernan	Siljander
Hall, Ralph	McKinney	Simon
Hall, Sam	McNulty	Sisisky
Hamilton	Mica	Skeen
Hammerschmidt	Michel	Skelton
Hance	Mikulski	Slattery
Harrison	Miller (CA)	Smith (FL)
Hatcher	Mineta	Smith (IA)
Hefner	Minish	Smith (NE)
Hertel	Moakley	Smith, Denny
Hightower	Molinaro	Smith, Robert
Hiler	Mollohan	Snowe
Hillis	Montgomery	Snyder
Holt	Moody	Solarz
Hopkins	Moore	Spence
Horton	Moorhead	Spratt
Howard	Morrison (CT)	Staggers
Hoyer	Morrison (WA)	Stangeland
Huckaby	Mrazek	Stark

Stokes	Traxler	Whitten
Stratton	Udall	Williams (MT)
Studds	Vander Jagt	Williams (OH)
Stump	Vandergriff	Winn
Sundquist	Vento	Wirth
Swift	Vucanovich	Wise
Synar	Walgren	Wolf
Tallon	Watkins	Wolpe
Tauke	Waxman	Wortley
Tauzin	Weaver	Wright
Taylor	Weber	Wyllie
Thomas (CA)	Weiss	Yatron
Thomas (GA)	Wheat	Young (FL)
Torres	Whitehurst	Young (MO)
Torricelli	Whitley	Zablocki
Towns	Whittaker	Zschau

NAYS—32

Brown (CO)	Forsythe	Roberts
Clay	Frenzel	Roemer
Conable	Gejdenson	Sabo
Coughlin	Goodling	Schroeder
Dannemeyer	Gregg	Solomon
Dickinson	Hansen (UT)	Stenholm
Durbin	Hawkins	Volkmer
Dymally	Miller (OH)	Walker
Edgar	Mitchell	Wyden
Emerson	Murphy	Yates
Evans (IA)	Ratchford	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Jacobs	Oberstar	Ottinger
--------	----------	----------

NOT VOTING—34

Applegate	Hansen (ID)	Martinez
AuCoin	Harkin	Owens
Badham	Hartnett	Robinson
Bateman	Heftel	Rose
Bellenson	Hubbard	Rostenkowski
Cheney	Hunter	Smith (NJ)
Conyers	Jeffords	St Germain
Crockett	Jones (NC)	Valentine
Dixon	Kogovsek	Wilson
Fuqua	Kolter	Young (AK)
Garcia	Lehman (CA)	
Gramm	Lloyd	

□ 1015

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and hopefully the program has been devised for next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the distinguished minority leader will yield, he will be happy, as I am sure all of our colleagues will be happy, to know that we plan to adjourn at about 6 o'clock this evening and have no session tomorrow. There will be no session Friday.

Today we will take up the State Department authorization bill under an open rule.

The only other thing we hope to accomplish today is to adopt the rule,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

the rule only, on H.R. 1590, the Emergency Commodity Distribution Act.

Monday we will debate suspensions and have general debate on the Emergency Commodity Distribution Act, but not go into any 5-minute rule or have any votes on Monday.

The suspensions to be taken up on Monday are as follows:

H.R. 2712, public health emergencies bill;

H.R. 2713, Office of Health Promotion;

H.R. 1076, Jones Act amendments; and

H.R. 3151, Jack Watson Post Office. We will postpone the votes on suspensions until Tuesday.

We will meet at noon on Tuesday and have votes on the suspensions, conclude H.R. 2669, the Department of Defense authorizations for fiscal year 1984, and H.R. 1590, the Emergency Commodity Distribution Act next week.

Any further program would be announced later. The possibility may exist for a conference committee report on the budget, or something else, but that is far from certain.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman tell us for sure whether or not those votes on suspensions would be the first thing on Tuesday, then, or would they be later in the day? This last week we were on, we were off, we were on.

Mr. WRIGHT. Let us just make a rule now and stick with it. They will be first on Tuesday, if that is agreeable with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Normally that is the procedure. I guess we can get arguments both ways. Members' planes do not get in until such-and-such a time, and like to have them later, but I think our procedure has been such, if they have been rolled, that those roll-calls are the first thing the following day, and that would be my preference, I believe.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman has no objection, we will have them first on Tuesday. We will vote first on the suspensions on Tuesday.

Mr. MICHEL. Now may I bring up another subject, because of the change in schedule last week. We all have a limitation on office expense, although we can roll computer money into expense, and one thing and another, and those Members who are on the west coast get air fares that are half my fare, or maybe a third of what I have to pay. There are many more of us in the midsection of the country buying tickets 7 days ahead in order to really try to do something about saving some money on the expense account around here by buying 7 days ahead, having the program then so changed from time to time that we cannot take advantage of it.

I think the difference between here and Syracuse is \$120 round trip if you have not used the ticket you bought ahead. Out in Illinois it is about the same thing. It is a significant amount. So I am trying to underscore the point of specifically having a schedule pretty well agreed to. I recognize there has got to be some degree of flexibility, but that is another factor in this whole thing that more and more Members are coming to me about, and I think we ought to take it into account.

Mr. WRIGHT. I welcome the knowledge that more and more Members are coming to the gentleman from Illinois. I have a few more I could turn your way. If you are holding court on the uncertainty of the schedule, I can supply some who will advise you of their difficulties.

I am curious about the gentleman's travel plans. Does the gentleman take the scenic route to Peoria?

Mr. MICHEL. How is that again?

Mr. WRIGHT. I say, the gentleman says he pays three times as much to get to Peoria as other Members pay to get to the west coast.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and I think it all came about through deregulation of the airlines.

Mr. WRIGHT. I agree. I agree with the gentleman, but that is not on the schedule for next week.

I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, we try, as best we can, to accommodate the schedule that we have set out. Sometimes unexpected things occur, as occurred yesterday. To tell you the whole truth, the leadership on our side was not aware of the kind of a rule that was going to be reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday. We were not aware of what was going to happen. The debacle that occurred yesterday should not have occurred. I think both of us would agree to that. Having occurred, it puts us behind the schedule on appropriation bills.

There is at present an unresolved difference on another of the appropriations bills. Those things happen, and they are not scheduled.

I was saying yesterday at the hanging of DON FUQUA, the portrait unveiling for the distinguished chairman of our Science Committee, that it is a pity that modern science has been able to devise a means to get an American on the Moon but has not yet been able to devise a means to get a Congressman who has missed 16 votes on a Friday off the ceiling.

Mr. MICHEL. Finally, if I might inquire of the distinguished gentleman, did I understand him to say that there would be no session at all tomorrow?

Mr. WRIGHT. No session on Friday, tomorrow; none whatever. We will adjourn about 6 p.m. today. No votes on Monday unless someone is obstreperous and unkind enough to demand a vote on the Journal or something of that kind. We will adopt a rule, but we

will have general debate under a rule adopted today.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM TODAY TO MONDAY, JUNE 13, 1983

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1030

A NEW GOAL AND A NEW APPROACH IN THE START NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President announced our country's new position in the START negotiations. More important than the classified changes in the numbers is the fact that our goal has changed and our approach appears to have changed.

Our new goal is stability at reduced levels with the elimination of first strike fears. Our new approach emphasizes flexibility. This new strategic approach which is materializing in the United States with broad bipartisan support is an approach which offers material benefits to the Soviet Union, as well as to ourselves, if the Soviets are wise enough to respond within this framework. There is nothing wrong with the goals of "deep reductions, modernization for stability, and the elimination of the first strike threat." If the Soviets have something better to offer mankind, we would like to hear it. If they share these goals but entertain different ideas about how to attain them, then let them take advantage of Ambassador Rowny's new flexibility and pass them on.

But, Mr. Speaker, the ball is in their court. Now let us get the show on the road.

APARTHEID VICTIMS HANGED IN SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, last night three names were added to the list of victims of South African apartheid—Simon Mogoerane, Jerry Semano Mosololi, and Marcus Motaung. They join the long list of its victims, including Steve Biko, Neil Aggett, and many others. They were hanged last night by the only institutionalized and legalized racist society we have left in the world. Their crime? They opposed that racism and that society.

Even the U.S. Government, through its "constructive engagement," asked for clemency; but as we all know, "quiet diplomacy" and "constructive engagement" have not changed anything in South Africa.

There is a black spiritual called, "Were You There?" And indeed that question needs to be asked today. Were we there?

Indeed America was there at the hanging. We were there by allowing the sale of Krugerrands in this country, which provides funds for apartheid. We were there by allowing American corporate investment in South Africa, which provides the economic undergirding for apartheid. We were there by allowing United States bank loans to provide economic support for the scaffold of apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have failed to realize what that struggle is about, and how we in the United States are implicated in the injustice and murder of apartheid.

RESOLUTION ON SOUTH AFRICAN HANGINGS THWARTED BY ADHERENCE TO HOUSE PRO- CEDURES

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

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with my heart very heavy. Last night we had an opportunity to add to the voices of those millions of people throughout this world who asked for clemency for the three people who were hanged at 10 o'clock eastern standard time last night in South Africa.

My heart is heavy because indeed, having the opportunity to speak out on their behalf to try to save their lives, we failed in that opportunity because one Member of this Congress decided that he would object on a procedural matter.

I would like to bring this issue forward, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is most important that we put human life before we do the policies and procedures of this House.

I thank the Speaker and the Members of this body.

THE PRESIDENT'S REVISED ARMS CONTROL POLICY

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I hate to spoil the honeymoon over the President's latest attempt to salvage what has so far been a disastrous arms control policy, but it now seems to me that the latest START proposal the President unveiled yesterday flies directly in the face of his proposal to build 100 MX missiles.

The President's latest START proposal—I guess we can call this son of START—calls for putting fewer warheads on more missiles, but the President is asking Congress for \$20 billion over the next 5 years for an MX missile that puts more warheads on fewer missiles.

Talk about carnivorous vegetarian, this plan is a hoax. The President's plan that we are asked to approve runs counter to the President's own arms program.

I say that we should put this carnivorous vegetarian out of its misery. If the President really wants to put fewer warheads on more missiles, if he really wants arms control, the best thing Congress can do for him is to kill the MX missile.

Mr. Speaker, the President's asking to have 1,000 MX warheads as part of his arms control plan is like buying 1,000 Hershey bars the day before you begin a diet.

EQUAL PAY ACT ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I and many of my colleagues are gathered here today to observe the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Equal Pay Act of 1963. We will point out how this landmark legislation, signed on June 10, 1963, by President John F. Kennedy, has succeeded. And we will discuss how and why it has failed.

Since 1963, women have surged into the work force in ever greater numbers. Yet their pay is very rarely equal to men. Women are not paid equally for doing equal work. In every occupation examined recently by the Bureau of Labor Statistics—every single one—women as a group were paid less than men doing the same job, despite the Equal Pay Act.

Even more crucial to the economic survival of women and their families, women are not paid equally for work comparable to men. In hearings I co-chaired last fall, we learned that

teachers and nurses often make less than liquor clerks and tree trimmers.

The framers of the Equal Pay Act of 1963 understood this problem of comparable worth very well. The original equal pay proposal, in fact, established the concept of equal pay for work of comparable value. This proposal was abandoned in the interests of compromise.

As a result, women's pay today is roughly 59 percent of men's pay. In 1963 women's pay was 61 percent of men's.

The Equal Pay Act has failed—but it has also succeeded. Without it, more than 286,000 employees—most of them women—would not have won more than \$173 million in equal pay settlements. And thousands of other employers might have persisted in traditional patterns of pay discrimination.

We mark this anniversary in the hope that we can go on from the Equal Pay Act to an economy in which all Americans receive fair, adequate, and appropriate pay for the work they do.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I join Representative FERRARO in honoring the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. Twenty years after passage of legislation to insure equal pay for women and men, we are still fighting for the equal rights amendment which would cement the protections of the Equal Pay Act into our Constitution.

I would like to share with you a statement during that debate in 1963 given by the late Senator Philip Hart from Michigan:

We have long passed the time when women were allegedly working for "pin money." Women are working to earn a living, to support families, or to contribute to the family's ability to send the children to college—in addition to whatever personal sense of achievement may be involved. The supermarket does not have a special price on its groceries for women, the doctor does not have a special rate for them, their rent is not based on sex. Why then do we allow a pay differential to continue which gives them a smaller paycheck than others performing the same work?

Twenty years later, Senator Hart's words ring true. His words are as applicable to the equal rights amendment as they were to the Equal Pay Act, because both underscore the fact that women's issues are economic issues. Equal rights under the law translate into dollars and cents. American women know that. They know that equality of legal rights is more than simple justice, it is simply survival.

ANNIVERSARY OF EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I know that my salary is the same as my male colleagues. Yet even though today we honor the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, not all salaries in America are determined this fairly.

Over the last 20 years, this country has seen the most blatant forms of pay discrimination ended. But injustices continue, right under our own noses here on Capitol Hill. Subtle practices that prevent women employees from getting what they have earned—equal pay for equal work—still exist. Today we remind ourselves that the force of the law has accomplished much, but more work needs to be done. It needs our leadership, our continued efforts to focus attention on the continuing wage gap.

In traditionally female occupations, most employers woefully undervalue the skills, efforts, and responsibilities necessary to do a job well. Quality performances in these professions such as nursing and teaching are vital to our society, and we are becoming painfully aware of the consequences of inadequate pay.

In the new technological society now emerging in America, we need all hands on deck. To be truly competitive in the world, the future of our Nation will depend on all the talent we can muster—both women and men—working together. Yet this can only happen when women are receiving equal pay for their contributions to our country's growth. Only then will this Nation truly be ready to move forward into the future.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mr. MRAZEK. Madam Speaker, I rise today with Congresswoman FERRARO to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the passage of the Equal Pay Act. Unfortunately, the spirit of this law is the sole cause for celebration today, for current statistics show that we still have a long way to go to secure the equitable treatment that women properly deserve.

In 1963, when the Equal Pay Act was introduced, there were 24.5 million women in the work force. Today there are 47 million. In 1963, 38 percent of all women over 18 were working. Today it is 52 percent. Whether women have entered the workplace because of a need for increased challenges or, as in most cases, necessity,

the significance of this change in the demographics of the workplace should not be overlooked or understated.

Women today constitute 43 percent of the Nation's work force. It is logical to assume that women would be paid the same amount for work of comparable value by men. However, the grim reality is that this is not the case. Three out of five women earn less than \$10,000, with one third making less than \$7,000, while the average annual income for a man is \$21,000.

In his letter to Vice President Johnson in 1963 urging adoption of the Equal Pay Act, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz stressed the importance of congressional action to eliminate discrimination in the workplace. He said:

It is difficult to find any single industry in the United States which does not depend to a substantial degree upon the skills, talent, and energy of American women. Yet in those statistical analysis that are available, it is overwhelmingly apparent that these important contributions by women are not rewarded in the same manner as are similar contributions by men.

These same concerns are still prevalent today. I urge my colleagues to reaffirm their commitment to the Equal Pay Act on its 20th anniversary and to support legislation that further advances the notion of equality for women in our country.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mr. MOODY. Madam Speaker, on the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act it is important to make several points.

First, most women in the labor force do not have a choice of whether or not to work. Gone are the days when women simply supplemented family incomes. Twenty percent of the women in the labor force today are the family's sole source of income, and those families are systematically poorer than other families. Of the remaining 80 percent of working women, most absolutely must work for their families' health and material well-being.

Second, it is indisputable that women make less than men do. Exact comparisons of wages paid to men and women are difficult to make for two reasons: First, workers in professions dominated by men tend to make more than in professions dominated by women. Engineers, for example, are paid more than nurses, and the male-female ration between men and women in those two professions is obviously different. Second, women have only recently entered the work force in such large numbers—double in the

last decade, and tend to have less seniority and time in grade.

But despite the difficulties of comparison, the stark fact remains that on the average women only make 60 cents for every dollar made by men. The economic gender gap is 40 percent of men's wages—an enormous gap indeed.

There are two ways in which we as a society must work to eliminate this economic gap. First, we must try to end the substantial vestiges of discrimination in salaries and promotions which remain between the sexes.

Second, we must reform educational channeling and sex stereotyping so that female students in high schools and colleges go into math, sciences, and other disciplines that lead to higher pay and a wider range of professional options.

Madam Speaker, if the Equal Pay Act should be enforced in reality as well as spirit we will have to work hard on ways to close this economic gender gap.

□ 1045

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, tomorrow is the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Equal Pay Act. This legislation is a landmark in efforts to provide equal status to women in our Nation.

Ours is a nation founded on the promise of fairness and equality of opportunity. It is inherent in the fabric of our constitutional Government. For that reason, we in the Congress must remain firmly committed to that promise and remain vigilant in maintaining the principle of equal pay for equal work.

But Madam Speaker, while the commitment is strong, our laws are weak. The next step in this struggle is the question of pay equity. Pay equity means that jobs which are predominated by women should provide pay and benefits comparable to those predominated by men with equivalent education and training. By the end of this decade, it is my hope that this Congress will enact laws so that it can no longer be said of our society, as was reported by the National Academy of Sciences just 2 years ago, that the more an occupation is dominated by females, the less it pays in comparison to occupations dominated by males.

THE FEMINIZATION OF POVERTY

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, last year the President's Commission on Economic Opportunity issued its final report. As a member of that Commission, I was proud of the work we did to document the continuing problem of poverty. But I was dismayed by the results of our investigations.

We found that poverty in our country is not declining, and that those who live in poverty are increasingly women and their children. The "feminization of poverty" is a complex phenomenon—but it can be attributed at least in part to persistent, institutional, occupational discrimination.

As we now mark the 20 years since enactment of the Equal Pay Act, the challenge of insuring equal opportunity remains unmet. The real impact of the Equal Pay Act will be felt only when we stop forcing women into occupational ghettos—and begin to recognize and compensate workers in those traditionally female, and historically underpaid, jobs.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

Mr. REGULA reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I remember the great excitement 20 years ago when the equal pay legislation was passed.

I remember the diligent work that went into the passage of that legislation: President Kennedy had appointed a Commission on the Status of Women, several States had cooperated in establishing State commissions; President Johnson pressed his Cabinet members to gather the pertinent statistics to aid in the formulation of a policy, then Speaker McCormack encouraged legislation in the House. I am proud that my husband, the late

Hale Boggs, the majority whip at the time, was very instrumental in helping to have the legislation passed.

I am very happy to celebrate the 20th anniversary of its passage, but I am very unhappy that 20 years later the newest Labor Department statistics show that women receive only 60 percent of the pay for men.

Also that families headed by two parents have an average income of \$25,069, whereas families headed by a single female have an income of only \$10,950.

I am also very sad, Mr. Speaker, that the retired women of this country are becoming the poorest of the poor in our land, the result of the fact that their pay during all the years they were contributing to their retirement income was lower than that of men.

I hope that we will rededicate ourselves on this 20th anniversary to making certain that this inequity is, indeed, finally addressed.

THE KEMP-ROTH IDEA IS WRONG

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

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I think we all agree that something has to be done to reduce the deficit, if only symbolically, as a protest against the economic nightmare that this administration has brought to the country.

I think we have to do that by approaching realistically the third year of the tax cut. I stand here to recommend that it should be capped; that is to say that it should be repealed as to all individual income in excess of \$35,700 a year. That, of course, is the amount taxable for social security purposes during 1983.

I would oppose an outright and total repeal because that would create a grave hardship on those lower income Americans who would still continue to be subject to the mandatory increases in social security taxes.

I think it is essential that we approach the question of increased revenue by facing the fundamental fact that the Kemp-Roth idea is wrong, that it has allowed ungraduated reductions in taxes to the benefit of the rich and at the expense of the poor and middle income American.

ARMS WITHOUT CONTROL

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

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Reagan showed us how he plans to deliver his half of the famous MX bargain.

We sent him a real MX missile; he sent us back a balloon filled with empty air.

Some of you asked him for arms control leading to fewer warheads and more missiles. He gave you more missiles, period.

You told him you wanted long-term stability, and you were willing to pay the price of short-term instability. He gave you short-term instability, period.

We are being asked to be grateful that the Reagan rhetoric has changed. I suppose soft words and no arms control are better than harsh words and no arms control. But I remind you that either way, the American people still have no arms control.

We are being asked to be grateful that he turned down Richard Perle's plan for a large step backward in strategic arms control. I remind you that zero progress in stagnant negotiations and backward progress in stagnant negotiations produce the same result; nothing.

And that, my colleagues, sums up what's happened within the last month. Mr. Reagan got his missile. Arms control got nothing. The American people got nothing.

Mr. Speaker, what happened yesterday may be good politics, good public relations, and good acting. But I deeply regret it was not good arms control. In fact, it wasn't arms control at all.

A MORATORIUM ON SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY TERMINATIONS

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, since March of 1981, the Reagan administration has forced 226,000 Americans off the social security disability roles through arbitrary case reviews. Every Member of this Chamber has constituents who, though truly disabled, have been terminated from further receipt of disability benefits.

Disabled Americans should not be subjected to the harassment and mental anguish associated with the administration's disability review program. For this reason, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of H.R. 3045 to impose an immediate moratorium on all social security disability terminations.

Two days ago, the Secretary of Health and Human Services announced a revision in the administration's review procedures. Although I am pleased that the administration has recognized the abuses associated with its earlier regulations, Congress should evaluate the entire disability program before additional recipients are terminated.

I urge my colleagues to support an immediate moratorium on disability terminations.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FUNERAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE HONORABLE TOM STEED

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

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, as announced yesterday by the dean of the Oklahoma delegation, we in Oklahoma mourn the passing of our colleague, a former Member of Congress, Hon. Tom Steed.

I would like to announce that the funeral for Congressman Steed will be Saturday, June 11, at 2 o'clock at the John Raley Chapel on the OBU campus in Shawnee, Okla.

I know that many join with us in sorrow. In lieu of flowers, contributions can be made to the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Cancer Division, 825 Northeast 13th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. 73104, or the Emanuel Episcopal Church in Shawnee, Okla.

I also urge my colleagues to join us in a special order commemorating our former colleague on next Tuesday evening.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIAGGI). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, there are members of the minority that have been sitting here since 20 minutes of 10. It was my understanding that when we recognized Members for 1 minute speeches, that we do so in the order that they came; the Democrats first, the Republicans second; but for the last 15 or 20 minutes we have seen people from the other side of the aisle come in late and be recognized and we still sit here. We have important meetings.

I would think that out of courtesy to both sides of the aisle, that we would recognize those Members, Democrats first, Republicans second; but in the order that they arrived here, Mr. Speaker, in fairness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The order of recognition is determined at the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. SOLOMON. We are asking the Chair to be fair.

THAT SOUTH AFRICAN RESOLUTION

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

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, other Members may be curious about the mysterious resolution which failed to get unanimous consent yesterday. The resolution was offered by Mr. SAVAGE of Illinois.

The subjects of that proposed congressional clemency appeal—Simon Mongoerane, Jerry Mosololi, and Thabo Motaung—were convicted of killing four black police officers in South Africa during attacks on police stations.

These three men were not freedom fighters, only terrorists. Their victims were police officers who are universally recognized as civilians under the Geneva conventions. Unlike their victims, the three terrorists, all members of the Communist-controlled African National Congress (ANC), were hanged in South Africa last night and lost their lives after public trial with the full panoply of independent legal counsel, press coverage, foreign observers, and appeals. A week ago, the President of South Africa commuted the capital sentences of three other ANC terrorists convicted of lesser offenses.

Finally, the ANC representatives in New York and the Communist Party, U.S.A., led protests yesterday against the executions. An editorial directive in yesterday's Daily World said that:

We in the United States have a special responsibility * * *. All persons who are physically able should immediately call or wire the White House and their elected officials.

These three terrorists met justice without inappropriate intervention on the part of the Congress of the United States.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act, the historic piece of legislation which formally mandated the adequate reimbursement of women in workplace. We have come a long way in 20 years, with women now entering and excelling in fields formerly reserved only for men. In the process, many stereotypes have been disproved or even forgotten.

One idea, however, seems to persist, and that is the mistaken notion of the woman who works only as a hobby or for personal fulfillment. Many employers who pay lipservice to the idea of equal pay, at the same time rationalize their underpaying women by asserting that women do not have to earn money to support a family. That is a myth. The overwhelming majority of women who work do so for financial—not spiritual or emotional—reasons, and a great many of these

women are now the sole providers for their entire family. It is vital that we end the practices which allow women who support children to be paid subsistence-level salaries.

In any profession, the devaluation of women's labor is yet another obstacle to the achievement of true economic equality between men and women. In the spirit of those who fought for the Equal Pay Act, we must continue the struggle to eradicate all of the last vestiges of sex discrimination in the workplace.

□ 1100

ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET PROPOSAL SEVERELY EXACERBATES DEVASTATING EFFECT OF PAST TWO BUDGETS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, at least one Presidential adviser now admits that there is a gender gap. But he suggests the way to close that gap is to tell Reagan's story. What the administration has not yet admitted is that there is a reason for the gender gap—the policies of the Reagan administration.

This administration's 1984 budget proposals severely exacerbate the already devastating cumulative effect of the past two budgets. Reagan's proposals cut the very programs which provide support to women, their families, and the children who depend on them.

Already, 44 States have reduced their federally supported prenatal and delivery services for pregnant women, and primary and preventive services for women of child-bearing age, infants and children.

Three million children have been dropped from the child nutrition programs.

And he has proposed, on top of these cuts, the following for 1984: \$1.2 billion reduction in aid to families with dependent children, \$757 million reduction in food stamp benefits and a decision to count those benefits as income for determining how much rent people in public housing must pay; and youth subminimum wage. One million young women under the age of 22 head families, and the vast majority work in low-wage jobs. If we were to adopt President Reagan's new subminimum wage, these women would get \$90 a week.

The world out there is changing, and it is changing fastest for women. I hear from every sector of the country, and I can tell you that as the Washington Post said, there is a perception that the country is changing faster than politicians can handle the change.

I would advise Mr. Reagan to look at the economic facts for women, children and families today.

Families headed by women grew 51 percent during the last decade. The number of persons in poor families headed by women rose by 54 percent, while the number of persons in poor families headed by white men decreased by 50 percent.

Half of women aged 16 and older are in the labor force, up from 41 percent in 1970. In 1980, 13 percent of fully employed women had earnings of \$7,000 or less, compared to 4 percent of fully employed men. In 1980, 47 percent of fully employed men earned over \$20,000 a year compared to 10 percent of women.

Only 25 percent of American households are of the traditional, one-earner model. Today, 48 percent of all married women and 45 percent of mothers of preschool children work. These women work out of economic necessity to maintain their family's standard of living in the face of high inflation and interest rates.

The gender gap is really a failure to perceive reality.

LETTER OF PRAISE TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues I receive many letters every day, and every once in a long while I receive one that contains a suggestion that "O'BRIEN did it right."

I find those kinds of letters exhilarating. I keep them. I suggest the file is not bursting at the seams, but I still keep them.

Today as a constituent of the President I kind of think he deserves one of those kinds of letters, one containing a word of praise and respect.

His statement yesterday relating to START, to MX, to arms control, featured three major items: deep reductions, modernization for stability, and elimination of the first strike threat.

Mr. President, you said it very well in your press statement. You have given our negotiators generous negotiating authority, and most of us in Congress are ready to help in any way we can.

Mr. Speaker, if I could be granted one wish for this day, it would be that, for one brief moment at least, the Russian people might enjoy the luxury of a free press. My wish would be that they could read page 1 of today's Washington Post.

Would it not be great if they knew that we, the Americans, were trying with all of our strength and will to end the arms race and terminate the nuclear threat? Mr. Speaker, would that be it?

WE MUST HAVE SPENDING CUTS TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, a leading economist, Alan Greenspan, recently discussed the horrendous deficits that this Congress has been creating. He said that if the projected deficit were not in the \$200 billion range—Let me repeat that: If the projected deficits were not in the \$200 billion range, we probably would be undergoing a major economic expansion, the likes of which we have not seen in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, we must cut spending. We want a strong defense, high-quality jobs, and a more just society. We can have them. But first, we need to cut spending and let the economy grow.

REPRESENTATIVE GEKAS INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ASSURE TAXPAYER BENEFITS FROM CONGRESSIONAL SAVINGS

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, last week during the debate on the legislative appropriations many of us were shocked to learn that an individual Congressman's account, if he had money left over at the end of a fiscal year, could not be sure when he turned it back, as it were, that it would inure back to the benefit of the taxpayers. The procedures are so complex and the byways of expenditures and revenues so devious that it is possible that that money saved by individual Congressmen would be spent in other ways.

I am introducing a bill to try to correct that procedure, to make sure that if a Congressman, prudent in his actions, is able to save some money from the moneys allocated to him each year, that those moneys when turned back will go back to the benefit of the taxpayers, back to the Treasury.

DEMOCRATS HAVE UNEQUALED RECORD FOR TAX INCREASES

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, your call to raise taxes on the American people by \$6 billion next week has sent the researchers at the Guinness Book of World Records to their books.

Early reports are that this new tax increase you propose to levy on middle class Americans and small businessmen sets a modern record, because it is

the fourth tax increase in 10 months. Your record setting tax increase will mean that this Democrat Congress and its predecessor have raised taxes almost \$400 billion in 10 months. Never in the history of modern representative government has this record been equaled.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps of interest to trivia buffs, is that your budget contemplates not only this fourth tax increase but another tax increase, and a fifth tax increase, is also planned. So if you Democrats move fast enough you may be able to best the alltime record of Augustus Caesar, five tax increases in 13 months.

Mr. Speaker, I guess the Democrat motto might be, pocketbooks, like records, are made to be broken.

EQUAL PAY ACT

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago tomorrow the Equal Pay Act was enacted. This landmark bill, which forbids unequal pay for men and women with the same job, was passed with high hopes for abolishing the economic inequities women faced in the job market in 1963. Said one proponent during House consideration,

The time has come when we must banish all discrimination against working women, and wipe out the longstanding pay differentials between men and women doing the same work. Let us make this a day to be remembered by all women. Let us leave this House today with the knowledge that we have wiped out a great social inequity.

Sadly, mere passage of the Equal Pay Act has not wiped out the inequities facing women. The act has eliminated the most serious forms of discrimination, and has resulted in at least \$214 million in back pay awards. But uneven enforcement and deeply ingrained discrimination in the work force have made it difficult to realize the high hopes expressed by the supporters of the act. The wage gap persists, with women making only 60 percent of what males do.

I am pleased to join others in the House in commemorating the passage of the Equal Pay Act. More importantly, I remind all my colleagues that we have far to go to achieve economic equity for women and that the 20 year history of the Equal Pay Act reminds us we must pass legislation such as the ERA and the Women's Economic Equity Act. High hopes are not enough.

THIRD YEAR OF THE TAX CUT

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times yesterday morning ran an article which pointed out that some of our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle are already expressing doubts about their leadership's plan to cap the third year of the tax cut. I can understand their apprehension.

The majority claims that a cap on the July tax cut is a fairness issue. But the fact is that a \$700 limit in the tax cut would mainly affect people with incomes from about \$35,000 to \$110,000.

Does the leadership categorize a family making \$35,000 a year trying to put two children through college as wealthy?

Are these middle income taxpayers the fat cats who supposedly are gaining from the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981?

The real fairness question is this, Mr. Speaker: Do we in Congress have a right to go back on the promise of tax relief that we made in 1981? Will it be fair to rescind a tax cut for families who are putting their children through college? Will it be fair to increase taxes for families who are trying to buy a car or make a down payment on a new home?

If we really want to be fair, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we cap spending, not those already promised tax cuts.

HOUSE SHOULD DEFEAT CONFERENCE REPORT ON BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the conference on the budget resolution is about to send us one as bad as that adopted by the House 2 months ago. Let us defeat it. The world will not come to an end. We have already passed several appropriations bills and many others are moving forward without any resolution.

Having no budget resolution does not disturb me in the least. What does disturb me is the likelihood of another continuing resolution—one vote up or down vote on hundreds of billions of dollars of spending—the worst possible way to legislate.

The President should tell Congress right now that he will not tolerate another continuing resolution. He should put the monkey right now on Congress back to pass all 13 appropriations bills and lay them on his desk to sign or veto prior to September 30 according to constitutional procedure. Congress can then make its decisions whether to override or not.

This basic system served our Nation perfectly well until some overfertilized minds decided in recent years we

needed budget resolutions, reconciliations, and continuing resolutions, the growing use of which has closely coincided with profligate spending, huge deficits, and almost total congressional abdication of fiscal responsibility.

OPINION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON THIRD YEAR OF THE TAX CUT

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I hear you are polling your colleagues on whether your party should cap, defer, or repeal the third year tax cut. Since I am not in your party and will not receive one of these questionnaires, I thought I would relay what nearly 23,000 of my constituents told me when I asked them the very question you are asking your fellow Democrats.

Their response to the question, Do you favor the elimination of the 1983 tax cut; was 30 percent yes, and 70 percent said no. When asked if they would favor delaying the tax cut, their response was 10 percent said delay, 22 percent said make it retroactive to January, and 68 percent said leave it alone.

Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do that the general perception of Congress is low in the public opinion polls. That in itself is easy to understand when we promise to give the American public a tax cut one year, and then try to take it away the next. All we are doing is dangling a carrot before the public's nose just to see how far they will jump, only to take it away from their grasp.

Last year we promised President Reagan that for every dollar in tax increases, we would cut \$3 in spending. We never came close. It is one thing to give the President the shaft, but it is a whole different story when we try to pull the same stunt with the American people.

I hope you will reconsider your tax increases, Mr. Speaker, not just for the integrity of your party, but for the integrity of this body.

CAP ON HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST DEDUCTION

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

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, the American dream of owning a home may be in serious jeopardy if a major policy-making committee of the Democrats, the Democratic Study Group, has its way. Placing a cap on the home mortgage interest deduction is an idea being pursued by this organization, along with 40 other tax increases designed to increase Federal revenues.

Families depend on this deduction when they buy a home. If a \$10,000 cap were placed on the interest deduction, almost 650,000 families would be affected. Even moderate increases in inflation and interest rates would drag enormous numbers of home buyers into this crazy scheme.

We have started to see improvement in the housing market since the economy is getting back on the right track, and now there are those who want to apply the brakes. I can only interpret this half-baked notion by the Democrats as an underhanded attempt to get us to foot the bill for their new, big-spending budget. Why would anyone even consider capping home mortgage interest deductions? If Members are, then by all means, they should stand up and be counted. After all, constituents have a right to know.

OUR RULES PROTECT HUMAN FREEDOM AND LIFE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to some statements made earlier today, human life is best protected by assuring human freedom.

□ 1115

Freedom is protected by the rules by which we govern ourselves here. Those who would abandon the rules would abandon freedom and those who would abandon freedom are the true destroyers of human life.

The arrogance that allows some to believe that they are above the rules is the arrogance which has so often destroyed both freedom and life.

IMF QUOTA INCREASE

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, several Members have asked me about the status of the International Monetary Fund quota increase bill in view of the action of the other body yesterday. Apparently some mail is now being generated on the subject.

I am encouraged by the action of the other body in passing an authorization bill by a vote of 55 to 34.

I think the IMF quota increase legislation is vitally necessary to our economy and to sustaining our own economic recovery.

The President has said the IMF quota increase bill is a very important part of the consensus statement which was reached at the Williamsburg Conference.

May I say I think President Reagan deserves to be complimented by all Americans for the strong leadership

role he played at Williamsburg. The point is I am not sure when this legislation would be coming to the House floor, but I would encourage Members to keep an open mind and not be caught by one-liners suggesting this is a big bank bailout or it will aid profligate developing countries or the money could be better spent at home.

We have a vital interest in seeing that the international economy remains strong, open and fundamentally healthy.

The IMF fund will provide necessary bridge financing to that end, if we help. May I respectfully urge Members to study the issue carefully before making the decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

ARMS CONTROL UPDATE

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

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the President on his statement yesterday and for what I believe is a change in direction in the area of arms control. We are on the road toward stability, getting away from first strike capacity.

I also want to congratulate the President for his flexibility in his advice and directions that he is giving to his negotiators. This is an awesome responsibility that the President carries to bring sanity and order to the arms race in this world.

This has been a bipartisan effort in this Chamber and in the Senate to work with the President. This bipartisan effort must be sustained, must continue if we are going to achieve real arms control.

The President deserves our congratulations.

SENOR ALFARO'S COURAGEOUS DECISION

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there is an ever growing number of Nicaraguans disassociating themselves from the Sandinista regime in that country. We should not be surprised at this; history is replete with examples of the many who seek to leave totalitarian countries to escape the tyrannies of communism.

Yesterday the Nicaraguan consul general in New Orleans, Augustin Alfaro, asked for political asylum in the United States instead of joining his counterparts who are returning to Nicaragua after being expelled by our Government. The Nicaraguan diplomats were told to leave, of course, because their Government expelled three U.S. Embassy officials on Monday.

As one who has the privilege of representing New Orleans in this body, I want to direct special attention to Senor Alfaro's instructive decision. It took great courage, and I hope that my colleagues will take time to consider its meaning, and to ask themselves why he does not want to return to the bosom of the Marxist Sandinista regime.

MORE PRAISE FOR SENATOR HOLLINGS

(Without objection, Mr. MICHEL was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 during the 1-minute speeches, I praised Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS of South Carolina for his frank and quite accurate views on the failings of his party.

You may recall what Senator HOLLINGS said about the Democratic Party:

Every time a special interest appeared, we responded, every time a problem arose, we offered a single solution—money.

At that time I praised Senator HOLLINGS for performing a public service.

He has done so again and I want to share his wise insights with you.

In yesterday's New York Times, speaking of President Reagan, Senator HOLLINGS stated:

The definite perception (among voters) is "Ye Gods, this fellow's got a \$200 billion deficit, but if we let Tip O'Neill and Cranston and Mondale and Hart and that crowd get back in there there'll be \$400 billion deficits."

Mr. Speaker, I thought our colleagues might want to know that Senator HOLLINGS is still willing to tell the truth about his party's flaws and follies. I hope his splendid example is followed on the other side of the aisle in the House.

A BETTER SCHEDULE FOR THE HOUSE

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

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the leadership of this House, particularly the statement made by our distinguished majority leader an hour ago as to the schedule of this body.

I am sure none of our constituents will ever really understand how great it is for a Member of the House to be able to plan what he or she is going to do clear through next Tuesday. I think this is a step in the right direction. The majority leader alluded to the Congressman who hit the ceiling for missing 16 votes. Well, based on the reasonable expectations of what the schedule would be here, I only

missed 8 votes last Friday and was only climbing the walls.

I do not underestimate for a minute the difficulty in scheduling this body. I appreciate the efforts of the majority leader and the Speaker to accommodate the Membership and hope they will have more success in the future.

Next week the U.S. Interparliamentary Group will be leaving to meet in Orlando with our Canadian counterparts. We who have been appointed to this group just hope in the scheduling the leadership will take account of the fact that we will be leaving next Thursday around 2 o'clock. I hope the scheduling of votes would attempt to accommodate the Membership.

SGT. ROY BENAVIDEZ DOES IT AGAIN

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I rise to commend Sgt. Roy Benavidez of Texas. Some of you might remember Sergeant Benavidez received the Congressional Medal of Honor for saving several of his comrades while under fire in Vietnam. He was disabled and recently this administration's policy on social security disability took Sergeant Benavidez off the role. Now in their embarrassment they want Sergeant Benavidez back on. So, he is going to bring with him some 300,000 Americans that were being taken off the roles and so Sergeant Benavidez now is saving 300,000, disabled persons from being taken off the roles. I would recommend that the administration consider giving him the Medal of Freedom for helping in peace as he did in war. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution, the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of

order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived, and all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a unanimous consent request, but prior to that I would like to explain why.

In the Rules Committee, the Rules Committee gave 1 hour to the bill but somewhere along the line, either upon leaving the Rules Committee or when it got to the printer, there was a typographical error in which the rule now provides 3 hours. Both sides agree that it is not necessary for us to have 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on page 2, line 15, of House Resolution 198 "three hours" be stricken and "one hour" be inserted in lieu thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR) for purposes of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 198 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2915, the Department of State Authorization Act for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In order to expedite consideration of the bill, the rule states that the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute by titles instead of by sections, and each title shall be considered as having been read. House Resolution 198 further provides for one motion to recommit.

It should be noted that the rule waives a point of order against the bill under section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 402(a) pro-

vides that it shall not be in order to consider any bill which authorizes the enactment of new budget authority for a fiscal year unless that bill has been reported by May 15, preceding the beginning of such fiscal year.

This bill contains a supplemental fiscal year 1983 authorization of \$41.8 million for the U.S. Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting. Since the bill was not reported on or before May 15, 1982, it would be subject to a point of order under section 402(a) of the Budget Act.

Chairman JONES of the Budget Committee has informed the Rules Committee that a majority of the members of the Budget Committee would support an emergency waiver of section 402(a) in order to permit consideration of H.R. 2915. The Budget Committee advises that this action is based largely upon the declared need for additional funds to carry out international broadcasting programs. Further, the bill authorizes, but does not directly provide, new budget authority. Therefore, the Budget Committee does not object to this emergency waiver of section 402(a) in the rule.

House Resolution 198 also waives all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5 of rule XXI. Clause 5 of rule XXI prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This is necessary because certain provisions of H.R. 2915 might be considered to entail appropriations.

The bill H.R. 2915 authorizes \$3.29 billion in fiscal 1984 and \$3.59 billion in fiscal 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Inter-American Foundation. The measure enjoys strong bipartisan support.

I am not aware of any opposition to this open rule on H.R. 2915, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

□ 1130

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 198 is an open rule under which the House will consider authorization legislation for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1984 and 1985.

The rule waives points of order that would otherwise lie against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the Budget Act, as well as points of order that otherwise lie against the bill for failure to comply with clause 5 of rule XXI.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) pointed out, these waivers have become fairly routine for this legislation and there was no opposition to the waivers during our hearing in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of H.R. 2915,

and bill which authorizes \$3.29 billion in fiscal 1984 and \$3.59 billion in fiscal 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, and the Inter-American Foundation.

The bill also authorizes supplemental requests of \$5 million for the Department of State, \$15 million for the U.S. Information Agency, and \$21.82 million for the Board for International Broadcasting for fiscal year 1983.

The rule waives section 402(a) of the Budget Act because the 1983 supplemental authorizations were not reported on or before May 15, 1982, and would therefore subject the bill to a possible point of order.

In addition, several provisions of H.R. 2915 may constitute appropriations in a legislative bill, and the waiver of clause 5 of rule XXI is provided in order to avoid a point of order against the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to granting these two waivers, the resolution provides that the bill shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections, and it provides for one motion to recommit.

As to the bill itself, H.R. 2915 authorizes appropriations totaling \$3.289 billion for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, and it establishes the National Endowment for Democracy.

The amounts authorized for fiscal 1984 are almost identical to those requested by the administration. For fiscal 1985, however, the committee bill is approximately \$16 million higher than the administration's request.

In addition to these authorizations, the bill provides for the establishment of a National Endowment for Democracy, which will be a private, nonprofit corporation whose purpose is to promote U.S. private sector participation in democratic development overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule as reported from the Committee on Rules, and urge the adoption of the resolution so the House can proceed to consider the measure.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as modified.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 37, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—373

Ackerman	Edwards (AL)	Kramer
Addabbo	Edwards (CA)	LaFalce
Akaka	Edwards (OK)	Lagomarsino
Albosta	English	Lantos
Anderson	Erdreich	Leach
Andrews (NC)	Erlenborn	Leath
Andrews (TX)	Evans (IA)	Lehman (CA)
Annuzio	Evans (IL)	Lehman (FL)
Anthony	Fascell	Lent
Applegate	Fazio	Levin
Aspin	Feighan	Levine
AuCoin	Ferraro	Levitas
Barnard	Piedler	Lewis (CA)
Barnes	Fish	Lewis (FL)
Bartlett	Flippo	Lipinski
Bates	Florio	Livingston
Bedell	Foglietta	Loeffler
Bennett	Foley	Long (LA)
Bereuter	Ford (MI)	Long (MD)
Berman	Ford (TN)	Lott
Bethune	Fowler	Lowery (CA)
Bevill	Frank	Lowry (WA)
Biaggi	Franklin	Lujan
Bliley	Frost	Luken
Boehrlert	Fuqua	Lundine
Boggs	Garcia	Lungren
Boland	Gaydos	MacKay
Boner	Gejdenson	Madigan
Bonior	Gekas	Markey
Bonker	Gephardt	Marlenee
Borski	Gibbons	Marriott
Bosco	Gilman	Martin (IL)
Boucher	Gingrich	Martin (NC)
Boxer	Glickman	Martin (NY)
Breaux	Gonzalez	Matsui
Britt	Goodling	Mavroules
Brooks	Gore	Mazzoli
Broomfield	Gradison	McCandless
Brown (CA)	Gray	McCloskey
Broyhill	Green	McCollum
Bryant	Guarini	McCurdy
Byron	Gunderson	McDade
Campbell	Hall (IN)	McDonald
Carney	Hall (OH)	McEwen
Carper	Hall, Ralph	McHugh
Carr	Hall, Sam	McKinney
Chandler	Hamilton	McNulty
Chappell	Hammerschmidt	Mica
Clarke	Hance	Michel
Clay	Hansen (UT)	Mikulski
Clinger	Harkin	Miller (CA)
Coelho	Harrison	Mineta
Coleman (MO)	Hatcher	Minish
Coleman (TX)	Hawkins	Mitchell
Collins	Hefner	Moakley
Conte	Hertel	Mollohan
Cooper	Hightower	Montgomery
Corcoran	Hillis	Moody
Courter	Holt	Moore
Coyne	Hopkins	Moorhead
Craig	Horton	Morrison (CT)
Crockett	Howard	Morrison (WA)
D'Amours	Hoyer	Mrazek
Daniel	Huckaby	Murphy
Daschle	Hughes	Murtha
Daub	Hunter	Myers
Davis	Hutto	Natcher
de la Garza	Hyde	Nelson
Dellums	Ireland	Nichols
Derrick	Jacobs	Nowak
Dicks	Jenkins	O'Brien
Dingell	Johnson	Oakar
Dixon	Jones (NC)	Oberstar
Donnelly	Jones (OK)	Obey
Dorgan	Jones (TN)	Olin
Dowdy	Kaptur	Ortiz
Downey	Kastenmeier	Ottinger
Duncan	Kazen	Owens
Durbin	Kennelly	Oxley
Dwyer	Kildee	Packard
Dyson	Kindness	Panetta
Early	Kogovsek	Parris
Eckart	Kostmayer	Pashayan

Patman	Schroeder	Thomas (GA)
Patterson	Schumer	Torres
Pease	Seiberling	Torricelli
Penny	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Pepper	Shannon	Traxler
Perkins	Sharp	Udall
Petri	Shaw	Valentine
Pickle	Shelby	Vander Jagt
Porter	Sikorski	Vandergriff
Price	Simon	Vento
Pritchard	Sisisky	Volkmer
Pursell	Skeen	Vucanovich
Quillen	Skelton	Walgren
Rahall	Slattery	Watkins
Rangel	Smith (FL)	Waxman
Ratchford	Smith (IA)	Weaver
Ray	Smith (NE)	Weiss
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Wheat
Reid	Smith, Robert	Whitehurst
Richardson	Snowe	Whitley
Ridge	Snyder	Whittaker
Rinaldo	Solarz	Whitten
Ritter	Solomon	Williams (MT)
Roberts	Spence	Williams (OH)
Robinson	Spratt	Winn
Rodino	St Germain	Wirth
Roe	Staggers	Wise
Roemer	Stangeland	Wolf
Rogers	Stark	Wolpe
Rose	Stenholm	Wortley
Rostenkowski	Stokes	Wright
Roth	Stratton	Wyden
Roukema	Studds	Wylie
Rowland	Stump	Yates
Roybal	Sundquist	Yatron
Rudd	Swift	Young (AK)
Russo	Synar	Young (FL)
Sabo	Tallon	Young (MO)
Savage	Tauke	Zablocki
Sawyer	Tauzin	Zschau
Scheuer	Taylor	
Schneider	Thomas (CA)	

NAYS—37

Archer	Edgar	Miller (OH)
Bilirakis	Emerson	Molinari
Brown (CO)	Fields	Nielson
Burton	Forsythe	Paul
Chappie	Gramm	Schulze
Coats	Gregg	Shumway
Conable	Hiler	Shuster
Coughlin	Kasich	Siljander
Crane, Daniel	Kemp	Smith, Denny
Crane, Philip	Latta	Walker
Dannemeyer	Mack	Weber
DeWine	McGrath	
Dreier	McKernan	

NOT VOTING—22

Alexander	Frenzel	Lloyd
Badham	Hansen (ID)	Martinez
Bateman	Hartnett	McCain
Bellenson	Heftel	Neal
Cheney	Hubbard	Schaefer
Conyers	Jeffords	Wilson
Dickinson	Kolter	
Dymally	Leland	

□ 1150

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:
Mr. Cheney for, with Mr. Frenzel against.

Mr. OTTINGER and Mr. LEVITAS changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution, as modified was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BIAGGI). Pursuant to House Resolution 198 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2915.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, as modified, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New York, (Mr. GILMAN) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2915, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985, and supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1983, for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, the formation of a National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes. This bill provides the financial and personnel resources needed to carry out the day-to-day foreign policy obligations and operations of the United States abroad, including the vital services for protection of Americans abroad, and the Nation's traditional and public diplomacy activities.

At this point, I would like to point out some hard realities in connection with the State and USIA budgets. While the figures indicate dollar increases for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, the reality is that the amounts have not kept up with the value of the dollar overseas—which is where the majority of these agencies' activities take place. More important, the personnel figures tell an even harsher story. Since 1967, the Department of State has lost 10 percent of its personnel, going from 26,162 positions to 23,569. USIA during the same period has decreased personnel strength from 12,484 to 8,886. For comparative purposes, the Department of Commerce—which does not have the responsibility of maintaining 288 posts abroad, as does the Department of State—has increased 50,000 positions between 1978 and 1980 alone. On the other hand, the foreign policy problems and activities of the United States have grown

by leaps and bounds. Indeed, the number of countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations has increased from 85 nations in 1959 to 146 nations today. During that same period, the number of Foreign Service officers has increased by only 116 positions, from 3,717 to 3,833, yet the quality of their work is consistently high and is constantly improving.

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains fiscal year 1984 and 1985 authorizations, and a fiscal year 1983 supplemental authorization identical to the sums requested by the executive branch, with the exception of a fiscal year 1985 figure of \$16 million for the Inter-American Foundation in place of the open-ended authorization requested by the executive branch. Specifically, the committee has recommended an amount of \$3,289,297,000 for fiscal year 1984 and \$3,590,708,000 for fiscal year 1985 to fund the Department of State, USIA, BIB—which makes grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—and the Inter-American Foundation, and to establish a National Endowment for Democracy. The bill authorizes supplemental requests of \$5 million for the Department of State for a grant to the Asia Foundation, \$15,000,000 for the U.S. Information Agency, and \$21,823,000 for the Board for International Broadcasting, as requested by the executive branch.

Briefly, the funds included in this authorization request will enable these agencies and grantees to:

First, carry out U.S. foreign policy responsibilities and maintain our diplomatic relations with 142 nations and 47 international organizations;

Second, provide U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the OAS;

Third, provide consular services to U.S. citizens traveling abroad, and domestic passport services;

Four, enable those living under totalitarian rule abroad to receive objective news reports through the broadcasts of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty;

Fifth, provide for academic and cultural exchange programs between Americans and students and professionals of other nations to promote international understanding and goodwill;

Sixth, provide for an annual grant by the Secretary of State to the Asia Foundation to insure long-term, stable funding for the Foundation.

H.R. 2915 also makes certain changes in administrative authorities of the agencies. It would also enable the Foreign Service Institute to train citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—which will undertake a compact of free association with the United States—in order to develop a Foreign Service for these new states.

It provides for assistance to local law enforcement entities providing extraordinary protective services for foreign missions in the United States; requires the U.S. Information Agency to notify the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of all grants for a period of 2 years; provides for formal notice of agency reprogramming requests to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Foreign Relations provides legislative authority for the existing Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy which is located in the Department of State; provides that the Director of the Office of Foreign Missions in the Department of State be a member of the Foreign Service with certain administrative and field experience; provides for the release of a USIA film entitled "Thanksgiving in Peshawar"; provides for expenses of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO; provides for participation by the United States as host to the 31st annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly; and provides for a limitation on the salaries of future presidents of RFE/RL, Inc.

In addition, the bill provides, in title VI, for support for a National Endowment for Democracy. This provision reflects the recommendations of a report issued by the Democracy Program, a bipartisan group, composed of the two major U.S. political parties, labor, and business, which conducted a study into the ways and means of promoting democracy and democratic institution-building abroad through private sector approaches. The endowment, a private, nonprofit corporation, would be provided with funds to promote U.S. private sector initiatives for these purposes. This provision together with other proposals modified and approved by the committee, constitute the Presidential initiative originally called Project Democracy.

Project Democracy was originally a request by USIA for \$15 million in fiscal year 1983 and \$65 million in each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985. The committee has reviewed this request and has modified the proposal. Specifically, the committee has approved the expansion of existing USIA education and cultural affairs programming such as the Fulbright and Humphrey fellowship programs, the international visitor program, and the programs carried out by private sector groups such as Partners of the Americas, Youth for Understanding, and the American Council of Young Political Leaders, and other groups which have proved their excellence over the years. The remaining new initiatives were found by the committee to be more appropriate to be carried out by the National Endowment for Democracy.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents the absolute minimum necessary to

carry out vital U.S. foreign policy objectives. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2915.

□ 1200

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2915, a bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1983 and appropriations for fiscal year 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting and for other purposes.

At the outset, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), and the gentleman from New York, (Mr. GILMAN), for their efforts on this important legislation. The gentleman from Florida has already ably presented the purposes and content of the legislation. I, therefore, take this time to point out briefly some of the features of the legislation which particularly merit the attention of the Members.

First, H.R. 2915 represents the third 2-year authorization for the Department of State and related agencies reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. These multiyear authorizations are a positive contribution to the congressional budget process and permit the agencies to engage in much needed long-range planning for their operations and afford a better opportunity to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and its subcommittees to conduct more effective oversight over the departments and agencies that fall within their respective jurisdictions.

Second, the bill provides additional funding over the fiscal year 1983 levels for the dissemination of information abroad through the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. These programs are indispensable elements of our foreign policy and deserve the strong support of this body.

Third, the creation of the National Endowment for Democracy in title VI represents, as the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has already stated, the work of a broad bipartisan group composed of the two major U.S. political parties and American labor and business which concluded a study on and recommendations for new ways and means for promoting democracy and democratic institution building abroad through the private sector. The establishment of the endowment is a modification of the administration's "Project Democracy" initiative

and was unanimously supported by the committee.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that there may be an amendment to strike this particular section. In my opinion, adoption of this amendment would be a grave mistake. This bill does not provide funds for any political party; it authorizes funds for the purpose of assisting areas or countries to better understand our democracy and how it works—and to benefit from our experience in making that democracy work.

Finally, title VI provides formal recognition of the unique and vital role played by the Asia Foundation in advancing long-term foreign policy interests in Asia and provides a permanent legislative basis for the Foundation's annual funding requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this authorization legislation is essential to the operations of the Department of State and related foreign policy agencies. The amounts authorized are the same as those requested by the executive and are within the guidelines of the House-passed budget resolution.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 2915.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2915, legislation authorizing appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985. As the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on International Operations, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of our subcommittee. I believe the gentleman has provided a concise and effective overview of H.R. 2915 and I commend him for his hard work on this legislation.

I believe it is important to note that H.R. 2915 is the product of 10 days of comprehensive hearings and two markup sessions. During such consideration, our subcommittee had the opportunity to explore thoroughly the many aspects of operations and policies that this legislation addresses. It is my view that H.R. 2915 will enable the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Asia Foundation, and the Inter-American Foundation to carry out effectively those authorities, functions, and duties with which they are charged.

I might add also that the total funding levels conform to those amounts requested by the administration.

This measure also establishes the National Endowment for Democracy. As the gentleman from Florida indicated, this proposal emerged from the President's call last year and from earlier recommendations, for a long-range, bipartisan undertaking to promote the growth of democracy and democratic institutions.

The Endowment enjoys the broad-based support of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the AFL-CIO, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is my hope that the Endowment, with its emphasis on private sector initiatives, in the form of exchanges with democratic groups abroad, can help our Nation improve significantly its efforts to encourage free and democratic institutions worldwide.

Accordingly, I join with the subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida, in requesting that my colleagues support H.R. 2915.

□ 1210

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2915 and particularly for the National Endowment for Democracy which is incorporated in the authorization bill for the State Department and USIA.

Two weeks ago, Congressman MIKE BARNES and I led a delegation of Democratic and Republican Party officials and U.S. Government representatives to Caracas where we met with Venezuelan political party leaders to discuss the international democracy program. From our initial discussions with the Venezuelans, the response was positive and supportive.

The specific objective of the meeting with the Venezuelans was to discuss a working paper developed by the State Department which outlined the proposal for a regional democratic institute to bring together democratic political parties in the hemisphere for discussions of training and education in support of democratic political development.

Throughout the discussion, it was clear the Venezuelans were enthusiastic about the possibility of opening new contacts with American political parties. They spoke often of the need to strengthen the nongovernmental aspects of United States-Venezuelan relations and commented that this new American party initiative was long overdue.

With the Venezuelans in the midst of a very intense Presidential campaign, they were not in a position to begin detailed discussions for establishing the regional institute, but they encouraged the continuation of bilateral, nongovernmental discussions between the parties looking toward more concrete action following the elections.

The American delegation acknowledged the need also to elicit reactions from other regional democracies as well, like Costa Rica and Jamaica, before proceeding with the actual establishment of a regional democracy institute.

The national endowment for democracy is the natural followup of Presi-

dent Reagan's address to the British Parliament in June 1982, where he announced the U.S. intention to promote democracy in a way which would allow "people to choose their own way, to develop their own culture, to reconcile their own differences through peaceful means."

The idea of the democracy programs is to support those people and institutions committed to democratic government, to build and reinforce ties based on shared values between nations and to counter the spread of totalitarianism through the exchange of ideas and through promotion of democratic institutions.

The democracy program is only in its beginning phases, but the concept has captured the enthusiasm of all those associated with it, and I am confident it will develop into the vibrant force for peace and freedom that all of its supporters anticipate. I urge my colleagues to give the National Endowment for Democracy their strong, bipartisan support.

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain why the Free Trade Union Institute is getting nearly two and a half times more than either the National Democratic Institute or the National Republican Institute and nearly five and a half times more than the National Chamber Foundation?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from Florida. I think the chairman of the committee can answer the question more accurately.

Mr. FASCELL. First of all, let me state that that was the amount requested by the administration.

Second, we must appreciate that the Labor Institute program has been an ongoing program for many, many years, and this represents a normal budget request.

The Chamber of Commerce Institute, however, is brand new, just getting started, as are the others. Therefore, that accounts for the differential.

Mr. HILER. Has the Labor Institute then traditionally gotten a fairly significant sum of money from the U.S. Government?

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, and has been for years.

If I might add, by the way, it is a very successful program all over, supported by every administration since I have been here.

Mr. HILER. How much has it been getting in the past?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not remember the last appropriation, but we can get that for the gentleman. This is very close to the amount.

Mr. HILER. Will this amount then replace that amount or is it in addition to that amount?

Mr. FASCELL. No, this is the total amount.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, if I might also respond to the gentleman, my understanding is that all the parties involved, the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO free labor institution, have all agreed on these figures. This is an agreement by all parties.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY).

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I would like to engage the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) in a colloquy.

Section 108 of this legislation makes permanent a restriction first passed last year restricting U.S. contributions to the United Nations for the PLO or activities that support the PLO. I believe this is an important restriction, and I commend the committee for adopting it.

It has come to my attention during the last year, however, that there is some dispute about the State Department's enforcement of this section, and I would like to get the gentleman's understanding of section 108.

Specifically, should this provision be read to require the withholding of indirect costs allocated to the PLO units of the United Nation as well as direct costs?

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes. That is the intent of this measure.

Mr. BLILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Further, I have information to indicate that the U.N. Special Unit on Palestinian Rights had a series of regional seminars on the question of Palestine, which cost \$2.5 million in both 1982 and 1983; yet the United Nations reported to the State Department direct and indirect costs of only \$1.3 million in 1983 and \$0.7 million in 1983 for the entire special unit. My reading of this section would indicate that the State Department is obligated to withhold the U.S. portion of activities such as these regional seminars. Is that correct?

Mr. GILMAN. That is my understanding of the intent of this provision. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BLILEY. Does the Department of State have a responsibility to examine U.N. budgets carefully for activities that support the PLO and withhold appropriate portions of the U.S. contribution?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes; the Department does have such a responsibility and I might add that H.R. 2453 requires a

report from the Department of State concerning its implementation of this provision.

Mr. BLILEY. I thank the gentleman and I thank my colleagues for these clarifications. I believe this section is appropriate and again I commend the committee for its fine work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT).

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Chairman, let me first express my sincere appreciation to the chairmen of my subcommittee and my full committee for the strenuous work they have done in bringing this piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could give my undivided support to the legislation before us today, but I cannot.

There are some elements in this State Department authorization bill that I found disquieting during our consideration in the Foreign Affairs Committee, and which remain in the bill that is being considered now. Two aspects of the funding authorization are particularly troubling to me:

First, the inclusion of almost \$30 million over the next 3 years for Radio Marti, the latest attempt by the Reagan administration to intensify the cold war it is waging with Cuba, this time via a war of the airwaves;

And second, the provision of the bill that authorizes \$62.6 million of public funds for something called the National Endowment for Democracy. For those Members who receive the DSG or other legislative bulletin, you might already have read that this \$62 million is being given away to the Democratic Party Institute, and the Republican Party Institute, and the AFL-CIO Free Trade Union Institute and the National Chamber of Commerce Foundation, for such specific programs as "to facilitate exchanges between the two major American political parties, labor, and business and democratic groups abroad" and "to encourage * * * democratic development in a manner consistent with the broad concerns of U.S. national interests."

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that the same Members who have been chanting balanced budget and cutting spending in this Chamber for the past 6 months are going to vote today to give away more than \$60 million of taxpayers' money for a project that seems at best a boondoggle.

The legislation creating the National Endowment for Democracy was folded into this State Department authorization bill without adequate consideration in either the subcommittee or the Committee of Foreign Affairs.

The board of directors of the National Endowment for Democracy are hand picked and already mandated by this bill—the individuals already selected, with no public or open congress-

sional input. The board, which is self-perpetuating, contains at most two black members, no Hispanics that I can detect, and only two women. And this is the board that will, according to the authorizing legislation, be giving taxpayers money away to other groups to foster democracy.

I would question whether this board can sell democracy to the rest of the world when it does not even come close to reflecting a cross-section of America.

Mr. Chairman, how can we accept the arbitrary selection of two political parties, one labor union and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—to the total exclusion of all other political parties, labor organizations, business groups and other organizations—to control the distribution of some \$60 million of taxpayers' money for the vague purposes outlined above?

I cannot support it. I do not believe the National Endowment for Democracy is a project we should invest our constituents' money in, and I urge my colleagues to give this part of the bill before us a very careful look before we vote this afternoon.

□ 1220

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, this bill has frequently been the vehicle for substantial changes in the way the Foreign Service of the United States is managed. Earlier this year, there was a package of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 which the administration tried to get attached to this bill. I am pleased that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) resisted their entreaties.

A number of amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 are needed. When that bill was first written, it was written jointly by the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and by my Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Amendments to the act should be developed in the same cooperative way.

I intend to introduce legislation this summer to provide for certain needed changes in the Foreign Service Act. Among the needed changes are:

Better mechanisms to make the demands of the Foreign Service and the demands of family and children more compatible. We cannot continue to operate the Foreign Service as if no member had any family commitments.

Clarification of employee rights. Although we thought we had fairly clear understandings of how the rights of employees would be protected, the U.S. Information Agency has been acting in utter ignorance of the legislative history of the act and has been

refusing to recognize legitimate employee rights. Rather than forcing time-consuming litigation, which USIA has routinely lost, it would be better to make the law so clear that it could not be misinterpreted.

A stronger grievance mechanism. The current grievance system is far too limited in scope and far too dependent on the cooperation of management. We should provide Foreign Service personnel with a real internal grievance mechanism to protect their rights.

Benefits for former spouses who were not covered by the pension-sharing amendment we added to the Foreign Service Act. While we do not want to reduce the retirement benefits of people who divorced or retired before the effective date of the 1980 act, we should entitle their former spouses to the same benefits as those who were so covered. This affects some 150 former spouses, some of whom are in the most destitute circumstances.

Permanent law to provide compensation to employees who are held prisoner or hostage, as happened in Iran. After the Iranian hostage episode ended, we passed ad hoc legislation to cover that situation. At that time, the administration promised to submit permanent legislation. Since they have not done so, we need to write it ourselves.

I am glad this bill is unencumbered by major changes in the personnel system. At the same time, I plan to be working closely with the chairman of the subcommittee to develop needed legislation later this year.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. Having worked with my colleague for such a long period of time on the Foreign Service Act, I will say that we would not undertake to make any changes without the knowledge and leadership of the gentlewoman from Colorado. We look forward to working with her and making corrections that are obviously necessary.

But I agree with the gentlewoman this should be done separately. So I look forward to working with her on those matters.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that my committee has moved forward responsibly to authorize full funding for the Voice of America's vital fiscal year 1984 request.

Hopefully, the full House will follow suit today.

I am proud of this subcommittee chairman, DANTE FASCELL, who has the deep understanding of the Voice's mission that is required and I am gratified that my full committee chairman, CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, has also remained a longtime friend of this vital tool in the arsenal of freedom.

The USIA is seeking an overall figure of \$48 million for its radio construction account. This includes \$3.2 million for expansion of VOA broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, an enhancement that will involve 55 positions. The budget you consider today also includes \$2.5 million for the modernization of the Voice's Washington studios and \$6.3 million for long-overdue maintenance and repair of existing worldwide broadcast facilities.

The Voice, its facilities and capabilities have become a "baling wire" operation. Thirty-five percent of its transmitters predate the Korean war. Some of its equipment was captured from the Germans in World War II. It requires its own fabricating shop to manufacture spare parts no longer commercially obtainable.

While the VOA has six 500KW superpower transmitters—patched-up affairs, the Soviets have 37 modern counterparts. While VOA broadcasts 956 hours per week, the Soviets broadcast 2,158—even Taiwan broadcasts 1,008. The Soviets are stealing a march in the war of ideas all over the world. While Radio Moscow is broadcasting in 20 languages to the Middle East and Africa, VOA can respond to the challenge only with 8.

Mr. Chairman, Poland's Communist government recently filed protests that VOA broadcasts have served to "destabilize" the Warsaw regime by inciting protest and "encouraging destructive elements working against Poland's constitutional order." What better proof that VOA is an effective truth weapon on the side of free men and women.

Mr. Chairman, may I urge now that the full House respond in kind? Let me cite some of the important ingredients of VOA's pending request:

First. New language positions are needed, especially a 25-percent increase in the undermanned Polish and Baltic languages services;

Second. VOA's news, features, special programs and editorial services must be upgraded;

Third. We must fill discontinued correspondent positions in such key locales as Rome, Islamabad, Geneva, and Mexico City. It is unbelievable that budgetary restraints have denied America's voice in these critical areas;

Fourth. New engineering positions are required so that VOA can raise its technical capability to at least the level of BBC and Deutsch Welle;

Fifth. Computerization of VOA's antiquated and inefficient program distribution system for its 41 language services must proceed;

Sixth. Replacing 30-plus-year-old ancient transmitters in Tangiers, Morocco, and Munich, Germany—vital links in our broadcasts to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union—is a vital step;

Seventh. Finally, the VOA must construct new transmitter sites and fund leasing arrangements to improve its signal strength.

That Voice, Mr. Chairman, must be heard by freedom-seeking people everywhere. Recently, the VOA received a letter which asked "Why a country whose astronauts can easily speak to Earth is not able to transmit her own voice across the world".

□ 1230

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LANTOS. I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I just wanted to rise and identify myself with the gentleman's remarks. I particularly appreciated his effort on behalf of the Voice of America. I particularly want to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) as well as my friend from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for shepherding through this extremely important initiative.

I compliment the gentleman from Florida and my friend from California as well as from New York. All three corners of this country being represented in a project that holds such potential for the future of democracy and those people all over the world who look to this country for hope.

The one thing, perhaps above all, it seems to me, this country does represent is hope. And if we can broadcast that message through the Voice of America as the gentleman pointed out, if we can support an effective project for democracy, which is incredibly timely, as Mr. LANTOS has emphasized here on the floor; there are folks not only in Poland but throughout the Eastern Block nations, Africa, throughout the world, who will be inspired by that message, who need to know that this country still stands for those Jeffersonian principles to which we all aspire.

When Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life gave us freedom" he was not talking about only the American people, he was talking about those people around the world, the members of the human family, who desire for themselves, their neighbors and their children exactly what we want: freedom, and dignity, and individual rights.

I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for helping get

this money for the Voice of America, which is doing so much with all the problems they face, with antiquated transmitters, equipment and broadcasts: This response by the House to their request is not only a timely proposition, it is critical.

I want to take a moment to discuss Project Democracy, an initiative I have strongly supported, which is encompassed in this bill.

For the first time since President Truman's administration, an American President is laying out an active political agenda for our foreign policy that goes beyond weapons systems and economic interests. A central feature of President Reagan's new strategy is Project Democracy. The goal of this project is to promote free elections, opposition parties and competition, free press and trade unions—the institutions of democracy. Its focus, I believe correctly, will be in areas where democracy is fragile or nonexistent, like East Europe, Latin America, and East Asia, but where our efforts stand a chance of success.

I believe democracy is rapidly moving forward worldwide, its influence spreading into all of Western Europe, most of Latin America, as well as the largest nation of Africa—Nigeria—and into Asia as well. Its progress has become so rapid and formidable that it challenges oligarchs from all part of the political spectrum.

Promoting democracy will reflect the internal nature of the American order, give a sense of purpose to American foreign policy, as well as promote America's strategic interests by encouraging new and defending old democratic allies. This should be done in a nonpartisan way, unconstrained by the divisions of liberal versus conservative, left versus right. I am very pleased to see business and labor, Republicans and Democrats involved in this project, and hope its base of support and participation will continue to expand.

Having said that, however, I have certain concerns about the allocation of funds and the institutional guidelines contained in the committee bill.

First, I am concerned about the administration of the National Endowment that the committee bill would establish. As Project Democracy was originally proposed, the project would be under the auspices of USIA. I believe this is entirely proper. USIA is the natural existing organization, fully staffed and qualified, to manage Project Democracy.

By contrast, the committee bill would remove Project Democracy from USIA control, and set up an independent board of directors. This board would be self perpetuating, exempt from Executive control or Congressional confirmation procedures. I do not think that the creation of an au-

tonomous bureaucracy serves the purposes of the project.

Second, while organized labor would receive a generous allocation of funds, the committee bill would short change small business. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce may be a designated recipient, but small businesses are entirely overlooked under the committee's plan. I believe that small businesses are the heart of America's free enterprise system; surely they have a contribution to make to the promotion of democratic institutions.

I do not intend to oppose funding for the project, but I do hope that some of these concerns will be addressed and rectified as the legislation proceeds through the Congress. If these shortcomings are retained, I reserve the right to reconsider my support for continuation of the project.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I too want to commend Mr. GILMAN from New York, my distinguished chairman Mr. FASCELL, for their outstanding work. Let me just say that I am proud to stand with my dear friend from New York (Mr. KEMP) because there is no more eloquent or dedicated champion of free ideals around this globe.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) for his remarks and leadership that he has given as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

America telling its story abroad is a very important component of our survival. We have struggled through many administrations to get sufficient commitment in terms of priority and in funding to do an adequate job.

The gentleman from California has detailed all that which is on the record in our committee hearings and in the hearings of other committees on how sadly lacking we are as a great nation to be so far behind even in the facilities that we use—even in the facilities. Why it is that we cannot seem to get the commitment to build what has to be built to get our message across. I do not know any Member of this House who would give up his media in the effort to get his message across to his constituents. Yet, we as a nation have consistently for years insisted on tying one hand behind our back as we talk to the rest of the people of the world.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KEMP) is absolutely right. This committee was delighted to support the initiative of this administration as we did the initiative of the last administration, and as much as the commitment has been made, I am here to tell my colleagues it still is not enough.

There may be complaints from our colleagues about how much money went into increasing the budget for USIA. My goodness, it is a drop in the bucket compared to what we are

facing across the world from our principal adversary, and from others.

So, I would hope that our colleagues would understand that this has a high priority, not just in the administration but in the Congress in a very strong bipartisan sense, totally supported by the American people.

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and particularly in support of the authorization for the Board for International Broadcasting which provides grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcast in 21 languages of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe for an average of 1,025 hours weekly from one medium-wave and 45 short-wave transmitters, 23 of which have been installed since 1975. Radio Free Europe broadcasts to five East European nations, while Radio Liberty broadcasts to the U.S.S.R. in Russian and 14 other languages. Broadcasts are news-oriented with analyses based on expert research. While the Voice of America concentrates on projecting American society and institutions, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty programs concentrate on the interests of East Europe and Soviet audiences.

These institutions are vital tools in our foreign policy and in our support for freedom and human rights throughout the world. There is perhaps no greater human right than the right of freedom of information, freedom of thought, freedom of expression—in short, the freedom to know.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to share a letter I had the pleasure to receive recently from our former colleague, Ed Derwinski, who is now counselor to the Department of State. We all remember his expertise in foreign affairs and his devotion to a bipartisan consideration of foreign policy issues. His words on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are important and instructive, and I would like to read his letter into the RECORD:

The letter follows:

THE COUNSELOR,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1983.

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON,
Cannon House Office Bldg.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: When I was a member of the House, I was a strong supporter of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, consistently voting for their authorizations and appropriations.

In my new duties at the State Department, I have had the occasion to visit Munich and inspect the operations of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. I have also been working closely with Ken Tomlinson of the Voice of America, and in my travels I have learned the opinions of both government leaders and average citizens abroad concerning the radios.

The reports and observations I have received are very positive on the role the U.S. radios play. They are listened to, and a special effort is made by listeners to overcome

jamming techniques. The news content of the radios provides listeners with material very often denied them by their own governments, especially in totalitarian states.

In directing my views to your attention, I am naturally aware of the fact that you will soon be processing authorization and appropriations bills for the radios. I can reaffirm from my personal experience that our investment in VOA and RFE/RL is a sound, responsible adjunct to our foreign policy.

I hope you will share my view on the value of the radios and give them your strong support.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.●

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate title 1.

The text of title 1 is as follows:

H.R. 2915

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 101. This title may be cited as the "Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 102. The following amounts are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States and other purposes authorized by law:

(1) For "Administration of Foreign Affairs", \$1,474,418,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$1,580,820,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(2) For "International Organizations and Conferences", \$602,343,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$645,978,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(3) For "International Commissions", \$23,207,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$27,503,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(4) For "Migration and Refugee Assistance", \$344,500,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$326,400,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

(5) For "United States Bilateral Science and Technology Agreements", \$1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$1,700,000 for the fiscal year 1985.

PROTECTIVE SERVICES

Sec. 103. Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" by section 102(1) of this Act, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$6,300,000 for the fiscal year 1985 may be used for the provision of protective services directly or by contract in locations for which funds are not otherwise available to provide such services, to the extent deemed necessary by the Secretary of State in carrying out title II of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (relating to foreign missions), except that amounts used

under this section shall not be subject to the provisions of section 208(h) of that Act.

PIRACY IN THE GULF OF THAILAND

Sec. 104. Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Migration and Refugee Assistance" by section 102(4) of this Act, \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and 1985 shall be used for assistance to combat piracy in the Gulf of Thailand.

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION

Sec. 105. The joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to authorize appropriations incident to United States participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property", approved July 12, 1960 (22 U.S.C. 269f) is amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That funds appropriated to the Secretary of State for 'International Organizations and Conferences' shall be available for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share of the expenses of the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property for any year after 1981 as determined under article 16(4) of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised, except that in no event shall the payment for any year exceed 5.0 per centum of all expenses of the Bureau apportioned among countries for that year."

NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

Sec. 106. Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization", approved July 11, 1956 (22 U.S.C. 1928e), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition to the amounts authorized by section 2, \$300,000 of the funds appropriated for the Department of State for 'International Organizations and Conferences' for fiscal year 1984 shall be for the expenses incurred by the United States group in hosting the thirty-first annual meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly."

ALLOCATION AUTHORITY

Sec. 107. (a) Section 8 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2675) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. The Secretary of State may allocate or transfer to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States Government (with the consent of the head of such department, agency, or establishment) any funds appropriated to the Department of State, for direct expenditure by such department, agency, or independent establishment for the purposes for which the funds were appropriated in accordance with authority granted in this act or under authority governing the activities of such department, agency, or independent establishment."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated to the Department of State before the date of enactment of this Act.

RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO PALESTINIAN RIGHTS UNITS AND PROJECTS PROVIDING POLITICAL BENEFITS TO THE PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

Sec. 108. (a) Funds appropriated for the Department of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" may not be used for payment by the United States, as its contribution toward the assessed budget of the United Nations for any year, of any amount which would cause the total amount paid by the United States as its as-

essed contribution for that year to exceed the amount assessed as the United States contribution for that year less—

(1) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for the Committee on the Exercise for the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People (or any similar successor entity); and

(2) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for the Special Unit on Palestinian Rights (or any similar successor entity); and

(3) 25 per centum of the amount budgeted for that year for projects whose primary purpose is to provide political benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it.

(b) Funds appropriated for the Department of State for "International Organizations and Conferences" may not be used for payment by the United States, as its contribution toward the assessed budget of any specialized agency of the United Nations for any year, of any amount which would cause the total amount paid by the United States as its assessed contribution for that year to exceed the amount assessed as the United States contribution for that year less 25 per centum of the amount budgeted by such agency for that year for projects whose primary purpose is to provide political benefits to the Palestine Liberation Organization or entities associated with it.

(c) The President shall annually review the budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to determine which projects have the primary purpose of providing political benefit to the Palestine Liberation Organization. The President shall report to the Congress on any such project for which a portion of the United States assessed contribution is withheld and the amount withheld.

(d) Subsections (a)(3) and (b) shall not be construed as limiting United States contributions to the United Nations, or its specialized agencies, for projects whose primary purpose is to provide humanitarian, educational, developmental, and other nonpolitical benefits to the Palestinian people.

COUNSELOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Sec. 109. (a) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to strengthen and improve the organization and administration of the Department of State, and for other purposes", approved May 26, 1949 (22 U.S.C. 2653), is amended by striking out "Counselor of the Department of State and the Legal Adviser who are" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Legal Adviser who is".

(b)(1) Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after the item relating to the Under Secretaries of State the following:

"Counselor of the Department of State."

(2) Section 5315 of such title is amended by striking out "Counselor of the Department of State."

(3) The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on October 1, 1983.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL COOPERATION

Sec. 110. (a) Section 5 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor", approved July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 287q), is amended by repealing the eighth sentence.

(b) Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" by section 102(1) of this Act, \$250,000 for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 shall be available only for the expenses of the secretariat of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation.

ATTENDANCE OF CITIZENS OF THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS AT THE FOREIGN SERVICE INSTITUTE

SEC. 111. Section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4021) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Training and instruction may be provided at the Institute for not to exceed sixty citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in order to prepare them to serve as members of the foreign services of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and the Island of Palau. The authority of this subsection shall expire when the Compact of Free Association is approved by the Congress.

DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

SEC. 112. (a) Section 203(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4303(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence by striking out "appointed by the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Director shall have the rank of ambassador. The Director shall be an individual who is a member of the Foreign Service, who has been a member of the Foreign Service for at least ten years, who has significant management experience, and who has served in countries in which the United States has had significant problems in assuring the secure and efficient operations of its missions."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any Director of the Office of Foreign Missions who is appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

REPROGRAMMING NOTIFICATIONS

SEC. 113. Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 is amended by redesignating section 34 as section 35 and by inserting the following new section 34 after section 33:

"SEC. 34. Unless the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed reprogramming, funds appropriated for the Department of State shall not be available for obligation or expenditure through any reprogramming of funds—

- "(1) which creates new programs;
- "(2) which eliminates a program, project, or activity;
- "(3) which increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;
- "(4) which relocates an office or employees;
- "(5) which reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or
- "(6) which involves a reprogramming in excess of \$250,000 or 10 per centum, whichever is less, and which (A) augments existing programs, projects, or activities, (B) reduces by 10 per centum or more the funding for any existing program, project, activity, or personnel approved by the Congress, or

(C) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects approved by the Congress."

FOREIGN NATIONAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 114. (a) Section 408(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3968(a)(1)) is amended in the last sentence by inserting "(A)" immediately after "provision for" and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (B) payments by the Government and foreign national employees to a trust or other fund in a financial institution in order to finance future benefits for foreign national employees, including provision of retention in the fund of accumulated interest for the benefit of covered foreign national employees".

(b)(1) Section 5944 of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The chapter analysis for chapter 59 of such title 5 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 5944.

CODIFICATION OF MERESMAN CASE

SEC. 115. Section 2103(f) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4153(f)) is amended in the last sentence by striking out "determined in accordance with chapter 8 of title I of this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the same basis as a member retired from the Senior Foreign Service under section 607(c)(1), and section 609(a)(2)(B) shall be deemed to apply to such officer".

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION POLICY

SEC. 116. Title I of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended by section 113 of this Act, is amended by redesignating section 35 as section 36 and by inserting the following new section after section 34:

"SEC. 35. (a) The Secretary of State shall assign responsibility for international communications and information policy matters within the Department of State to an appropriate Under Secretary of State (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Under Secretary'). Such responsibilities shall include—

"(1) directing the formulation and coordination of executive branch policy on international communications and information issues;

"(2) overseeing and coordinating the functions of executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy;

"(3) exercising, on behalf of the Secretary of State, the authority with respect to telecommunications assigned to the Secretary by Executive orders, determining United States positions and the conduct of United States participation in negotiations with foreign governments and in international bodies, and coordinating with other agencies as appropriate, including the Federal Communications Commission;

"(4) chairing the Senior Interagency Group on International Communications and Information Policy; and

"(5) serving as principal adviser to the Secretary of State and the Deputy Secretary of State on the conduct of foreign policy in the area of international communications and information, and coordinating as appropriate with the other Under Secretaries of State on matters relating to the responsibilities of those officers.

"(b) The Secretary of State shall establish, within the Department of State, an Office of the Coordinator for International Communications and Information Policy,

headed by a Coordinator who shall be responsible to the Under Secretary. The Coordinator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall have the rank of ambassador. The Coordinator shall be responsible, on behalf of the Under Secretary, for formulation, coordination, and oversight of international communications and information policy assigned to the Under Secretary pursuant to subsection (a), and for overseeing and coordinating the activities of the Department of State and other executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy. On behalf of the Under Secretary, the Coordinator shall—

"(1) maintain continuing liaison with the bureaus and offices of the Department of State and with other executive branch agencies concerned with international communications and information policy;

"(2) chair such agency and interagency meetings as may be necessary to coordinate actions on pending issues to ensure proper policy coordination;

"(3) supervise and coordinate the activities of the Senior Interagency Group on International Communications and Information Policy;

"(4) coordinate the activities and assist as appropriate interagency working level task forces and committees concerned with specific aspects of international communications and information policy;

"(5) maintain liaison with the members and staffs of committees of the Congress concerned with international communications and information policy and provide testimony before such committees;

"(6) maintain appropriate liaison with representatives of the private sector to keep informed of their interests and problems, meet with them, and provide such assistance as may be needed to ensure that matters of concern to the private sector are promptly considered by the Department or other executive branch agencies; and

"(7) assist in arranging meetings of such public sector advisory groups as may be established to advise the Department of State and other executive branch agencies in connection with international communications and information policy issues."

DANGER PAY

SEC. 117. Section 5928 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The presence of nonessential personnel or dependents shall not preclude payment of an allowance under this section."

EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE STATUS FOR CERTAIN EL SALVADORANS

SEC. 118. (a) The Congress finds that—
(1) ongoing fighting between the military forces of the Government of El Salvador and opposition forces is creating potentially life-threatening situations for innocent nationals of El Salvador;

(2) it has been estimated that more than sixty thousand nationals of El Salvador have fled from El Salvador and entered the United States since January 1980;

(3) currently the United States Government is detaining these nationals of El Salvador for the purpose of deporting or otherwise returning them to El Salvador, thereby irreparably harming the foreign policy image of the United States;

(4) deportation of these nationals could be temporarily suspended, until it became safe to return to El Salvador, if they are provid-

ed with extended voluntary departure status; and

(5) such extended voluntary departure status has been granted in recent history in cases of nationals who fled from Vietnam, Laos, Iran, and Nicaragua.

(b) Therefore, it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of State should recommend that extended voluntary departure status be granted to aliens who are nationals of El Salvador and that such status should be granted to those aliens until the situation in El Salvador has changed sufficiently to permit their safely residing in that country.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title 1?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to title 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 12, beginning in line 16, strike out "Such responsibilities shall" and all that follows through the end of line 15 on page 13.

Page 13, line 25, strike out "pursuant to" and all that follows through "information policy" in line 4 on page 14.

Page 14, line 10, immediately after "(2)" insert "in accordance with such authority as may be delegated by the President pursuant to Executive order,".

Page 14, line 13, immediately after "(3)" insert "in accordance with such authority as may be delegated by the President pursuant to Executive order,".

Mr. FASCELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. This amendment reflects agreement between the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is perfecting in the sense that there was some concern expressed by that committee with respect to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce and the possibility of infringing on his duties and responsibilities.

By agreement with the leadership of that committee we offer this amendment.

I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Colorado, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BROYHILL, the ranking minority member and I have worked with the gentleman from Florida. We greatly appreciate being able to work this out in such an expeditious and noncontroversial fashion. I support the amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman very much.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, the administration has no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: Page 3, after line 3, insert the following new section 103:

IMPROVEMENT OF CONSULAR FACILITIES IN MEXICO CITY

SEC. 103. In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 102(1) of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for "Administration of Foreign Affairs" for the fiscal year 1984 \$4,000,000 to be used for the purchase of land for and the construction of additional consular facilities and for certain improvements in existing consular facilities, at the United States embassy in Mexico City, Mexico.

Redesignate subsequent sections of title I of the bill accordingly; and on page 12, line 9, strike out "113" and insert in lieu thereof "114".

Mr. DE LA GARZA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, first let me begin by apologizing to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the ranking member for having to do this in this manner. But I was recently in Mexico on other matters and found out there is a terrible situation in our Embassy complex, as far as the facility is concerned, for security and also the terrible problem that they have with the air quality.

The ambient air, for example, in Mexico City they get in 1 day the allowable levels that we have in the United States for 1 year. This could be corrected by changing the filtration system in the building.

Therefore, I have, working with the staff, prepared an amendment that would increase the authorization by \$4 million to the overall administration of foreign affairs for facilities; and that would be utilized, of course, after due studies by the committee and the Department, which I would have no objection to. As a matter of fact, I would so recommend.

I would hope that we might be able to convince our colleagues that this is a proper first step because you have seen what has happened in Teheran and what happened recently in Beirut, Lebanon. And Mexico City can be a de-

cision as far as safety is concerned because of the location of the Embassy.

□ 1240

Buying this property, which is a very good bargain, would be an investment for the United States because it is high value property that will increase in value in the years to come.

I would recommend to my colleagues favorable action on this amendment.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for his amendment, particularly for that portion which is directed to giving some type of an air-conditioning system or air-filtration system to our Embassy in Mexico which houses about 600 Americans.

It is my understanding and I understand the gentleman has reviewed the pollutant level that currently exists, it is a tremendous health hazard to those people who are serving us there.

I commend the gentleman for this amendment.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Yes; I have personally checked into it and it is either that or give them hazardous pay, because they go through there in 1 day what we allow for in 1 year.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague to provide for an air-conditioning and filtration system for the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City and to provide for the acquisition of property adjacent to the Embassy. As you may be aware, Mexico City is subject to extreme air pollution, which poses grave health risks for the Americans working there. At a time of important policy decisions in Mexico and Central America, I feel that it is imperative that our Embassy personnel have adequate, safe working conditions.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of comfort and luxury. Rather, it is a question of allowing our diplomats to work in an environment which is not hazardous to their health. Mexico City is recognized as the most polluted capital in the world. The pollution is not seasonal, but exists 24 hours per day, year round. Merely by breathing the air on an average day, our personnel inhale the equivalent pollutants of two packs of cigarettes. On bad days, when large amounts of dust are in the air, people get viral infections simply by walking outside.

Let me cite a few statistics to give you a clearer picture of the extreme health hazards of working in Mexico City: 248 tons of human waste evaporate into the atmosphere per day. There are high incidences of pollution-related skin rashes; intestinal ail-

ments; eye, ear, nose, and throat infections; insomnia; and cardiopulmonary diseases such as asthma, bronchitis, and emphysema among Embassy staff.

This situation would never be tolerated in a Government building in this country. The U.S. national standard for total suspended particulates require that an individual not be subjected to more than an average of 75 micrograms per cubic meter. The average in Mexico City is 258 micrograms per cubic meter, some 3½ times the legal limit. In other words, Embassy personnel are subjected on a daily basis to air which the U.S. Government says is extremely hazardous to their health.

As the recent example of the bombing in Beirut indicates, American personnel abroad are extremely vulnerable to terrorism. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the health risks posed by the environment in Mexico City are an equally dangerous threat to the health and lives of American diplomats.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his concern about our Embassy in Mexico and I know that he has spent a great deal of time in promoting cooperation between our Nation and the Government of Mexico.

Has the gentleman discussed his proposal with the State Department?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I have discussed it with the Embassy in Mexico City and they inform me that the State Department had no objection if we took this route. They would not want for us to disrupt their priorities in the allowable funding that has already been worked out, but that if additional funds—which is the reason for this amendment—were secured, they would look favorably to buying the property and working on the other facility to preserve and protect the health of our employees there.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority has no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague from Texas bringing this matter to the attention of the committee. We have discussed it informally and he felt it was essential to offer an amendment. And I can understand his feelings in that regard.

It is a matter which the committee is interested in, obviously, and we will explore it both at the staff level and otherwise in trying to deal with a rather serious situation in Mexico City.

The committee has urged the Department and the executive branch and we do it again in this report to increase its budget with respect to the needs of the Department of State for its facilities. There is a great need that we just cannot meet for budgetary reasons. This amendment is an effort, obviously, to point out that need. But right now, there are a total of unfunded projects that would be extremely useful if not necessary—I am separating that from security matters—of \$344,140,000 in places all over the globe where the United States is represented. You can see the magnitude of the problem that the Department of State Foreign Buildings Office has, and why they could not give our distinguished colleague from Texas immediate help with respect to the priority involved—they have less than half the money they need.

Suffice it to say, I cannot guarantee that there will be a specific allocation by law either in appropriation or otherwise for the Mexican problem, but we are very much aware of it and we will pursue the matter further.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GREGG

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG: Amend title I, page 16, line 21 by adding the following new section:

REPORT ON VOTES OF THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND SECURITY COUNCIL

SEC. 119. The Secretary of State through the Offices of the United States Representative to the United Nations and Representative to the Security Council shall on or before February 1st of each year report to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate all votes of the Membership of the General Assembly and Security Council. Such report shall include a comparison with the votes cast by the United States.

Mr. GREGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment requires that the Secretary of State through the offices of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and Representative to the Security Council report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate the votes cast at the General Assembly by the other member nations of the General Assembly and the Security Council and also report them in relationship to the votes cast by the United States.

The purpose and the thrust of the amendment is to allow the Congress in a more formal manner to track what is happening at the United Nations in the area of the votes cast by the member nations and the member nations of the Security Council.

This, I think, becomes important to us as a body because of the fact that many of the members who are participating in the U.N. General Assembly are also nations which we deal with on other levels, such as foreign aid, such as trade activities. And things which are done at the United Nations should not be allowed to be separated from the overall dealings with these various nations. We should have an ability to integrate the decisions which occur at the United Nations with the decisions which we make in other areas here on the floor of the House.

Thus, I think it is important that we have a sense of what the membership of the United Nations is doing in their voting activities.

Ambassador Kilpatrick, in a recent speech, made this point to Members of Congress who were in the audience when she stated essentially that she would like the Congress to more closely monitor what is happening at the U.N. She thinks that one of the best ways that the Congress can affect activities in the U.N. is to have the member states at the U.N. be sensitive to the fact that the Congress is actually watching what is going on and is sensitive to what they are doing and how they are casting votes. She made the interesting point that Zimbabwe votes with the United States 12 percent of the time while the Soviet Union votes with the United States 20 percent of the time. As a Member of Congress I certainly was not aware of that and I think that is information we need in coming to our decisions in areas of trade or aid or just alliance activity.

So this amendment, which is really not dramatic, it does not cost any money, it simply requires that the Secretary of State report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate the actual voting records and how they are related to the American voting record.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire for submitting this amendment. We now have a copy of his amendment and have no objections on our side of the aisle.

Mr. HILER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HILER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his amendment. I think it is, as he mentioned, not a major change from what already happens. It probably formalizes the procedure somewhat more and it will give this Congress a chance to better understand the actions of all the nations in the United Nations and how they act relative to positions the United States takes.

I think this would be invaluable information for the Congress as it deliberates a variety of bills and a variety of actions.

I applaud the gentleman and compliment him for his actions.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his comments.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREGG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, just as a matter of information, does the context of the amendment that the gentleman offers compel the voting records to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or simply to be reported to us in another manner?

Mr. GREGG. It compels that they be reported to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. And I would assume that if any Member wished to put them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that would be the prerogative of the Member.

□ 1250

They would be available to us through the Speaker's office or, if you are in the Senate, through the President of the Senate's office.

Mr. GEKAS. I would feel better about it—and I support the amendment—if it contained language that would automatically place the voting record at a designated time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But if we can find other ways and means to do so, I will be satisfied.

Mr. GREGG. That would be an available option for the Member upon obtaining a copy of the report.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the amendment on this side. We do not have any objection to the amendment.

I must say, however, that it is worth trying. My last recollection, having served at the United Nations, was when we had the annual tabulation on votes, it was a document inches high. It is going to be rather difficult. I am not sure about the expense. But the spirit of the amendment is fine, and therefore we have no objection to it. There may be some practical way, without it being too burdensome or expensive, to get the idea across that the

gentleman wants to get across in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of H.R. 2915.

Mr. Chairman, section 103 of this bill provides needed Federal funds for extraordinary protective services for foreign diplomats in the United States. As the committee report makes clear, under international law the Federal Government is responsible for the safety of foreign diplomats and foreign missions in this country. Yet too often, the financial burden of actually providing these protective services falls on State and local governments.

As a representative from New York City, which has the largest foreign diplomatic community of any U.S. city, I have taken an active interest in this issue. Last December, Congress passed a bill I had sponsored to double the authorization level from \$3.5 million to \$7 million for Federal reimbursements to local governments, and to authorize \$17 million for backlogged claims on services already provided. I am pleased to report that the Appropriations Committee has approved \$15 million pursuant to that authorization.

The additional \$6 million provided in this bill will help to ease the burden on strained local police forces in cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Boston, and it will underscore our determination that we will not tolerate terrorist activities such as those which have claimed the lives of Turkish diplomats in recent years.

By concentrating on protecting foreign officials resident in the United States, this bill expands Federal involvement in an area of clear Federal responsibility. I want to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for its leadership on this issue, and I urge support for this bill.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment printed in the RECORD last week which provides for danger pay for American Government civilian employees serving in Lebanon and El Salvador. In mid-April, a car bomb exploded outside the American Embassy in Beirut, killing as many as 16 Americans. In late May, a Navy lieutenant commander was gunned down in El Salvador. Both places are clearly quite dangerous. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) well remembers, we added a provision to the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to establish a danger pay allowance which may be granted to employees in a foreign area "on the basis of civil insurrection, civil war, terrorism, or wartime conditions

which threaten physical harm or imminent danger to the health or well-being of the employee." If El Salvador and Lebanon do not qualify, I do not know what does. The amount of money involved is really quite small since we have only 47 civilian employees in Beirut and 65 in San Salvador.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I thoroughly agree with you that danger pay should be provided to American civilian personnel in both places and perhaps others, such as Belfast, as well. The problem we have run into is that the State Department has interpreted the legislative history surrounding the passage of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to mean that danger pay could not be granted where nonessential personnel or dependents remained at post. I must confess that they have some basis for this view. Up until last November, danger pay was granted in Beirut. When the dependents were allowed back in, however, the State Department ruled that danger pay could no longer be allowed. To make it clear that we believe that danger pay should not rest on the absence of dependents, we adopted an amendment in committee, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) to say, "The presence of nonessential personnel or dependents shall not preclude payment of an allowance under this section." I think this language should handle the situation and I have assurances from the State Department that danger pay will be provided in both circumstances.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If I may reclaim my time, given what you have said, do you object to the amendment which I published in the RECORD?

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentlewoman will yield, I do not object to the purpose of the amendment. I do object, however to doing it by legislation. We have provided the administration with the authority to grant danger pay and we should lean on the administration to provide that benefit when it is appropriate. If we mandate the payment, we have to vote to cut it off when the danger has passed. Your amendment would cut it off in 2 years or when American troops are withdrawn. I am not certain that either of these dates has much to do with the level of danger at either post. In any case, I have assurances that danger pay will be granted, I think the amendment is unnecessary.

The gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) is the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and worked jointly with my Subcommittee on International Operations to write the Foreign Service Act. She has taken the lead on this issue by sending around a letter to the President requesting him to grant danger pay to American civilians and hostile fire pay

to military personnel in Lebanon and El Salvador. I have signed this letter and urge my colleagues to do likewise. When I spoke a minute ago about keeping pressure on the administration, I was thinking of letters like the one being circulated by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the distinguished chairman for that endorsement. Because of his assurances and my respect for him, I shall not offer the amendment printed in the RECORD. I do, however, have with me the letter to the President which the gentleman mentioned. It urges the President to provide danger pay and hostile fire pay to American personnel in Lebanon and El Salvador. I think that the least we ought to do for Americans ordered to serve in places where they might get killed is to provide a little pay supplement. We ought to do whatever we can to minimize the risk as well. I urge my colleagues to sign this letter and use this as a vehicle to do right by our people in dangerous foreign lands.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

The Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

**TITLE II—UNITED STATES
INFORMATION AGENCY**

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the "United States Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 202. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency \$701,427,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$861,039,000 for the fiscal year 1985 to carry out international communication, educational, cultural, and exchange programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 of 1977, and other purposes authorized by law.

(b) Of the authorizations of appropriations contained in subsection (a), authorizations of \$47,959,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$179,426,000 for the fiscal year 1985, for the acquisition and construction of radio facilities, shall remain available until the appropriations are made, and when those amounts are appropriated they are authorized to remain available until expended.

**FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR
DEMOCRACY**

Sec. 203. Of the amounts appropriated for the United States Information Agency for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985, not less than \$31,300,000 shall be for a grant to the National Endowment for Democracy (established pursuant to title VI of this Act) for use in carrying out its purposes.

**FISCAL YEAR 1983 SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORIZATION**

Sec. 204. Section 302 of the United States Information Agency Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1982 and 1983, is amended by striking out "\$559,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$574,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983".

NOTIFICATION OF REPROGRAMINGS AND GRANTS

Sec. 205. Title VII of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476-1477b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 705. (a) Unless the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed reprogramming, funds appropriated for the United States Information Agency shall not be available for obligation or expenditure through any reprogramming of funds—

"(1) which creates new programs;

"(2) which eliminates a program, project, or activity;

"(3) which increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

"(4) which relocates an office or employees;

"(5) which reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

"(6) which involves a reprogramming in excess of \$250,000 or 10 per centum, whichever is less, and which (A) augments existing programs, projects, or activities, (B) reduces by 10 per centum or more the funding for any existing program, project, activity, or personnel approved by the Congress, or (C) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects approved by the Congress.

"(b) The United States Information Agency may award program grants for the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 only if the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified fifteen days in advance of the proposed grant."

DISSEMINATION OF USIA-PREPARED INFORMATION TO FOREIGN DIPLOMATS IN THE UNITED STATES

Sec. 206. Section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 501."; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), information described in that subsection (whether or not prepared for dissemination abroad) may be made available, within the United States, its territories and possessions, to foreign diplomatic and consular officials accredited to the United States Government or to the United Nations or any of its related organizations. Any such official who receives information under this subsection shall not make or allow the further dissemination of such information within the United States, its territories or possessions, except to other foreign diplomatic or consular officials who are so accredited."

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN THE UNITED STATES OF THE USIA FILM ENTITLED "THANKSGIVING IN PESHAWAR"

Sec. 207. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 501(a), as so redesignated by section 206 of this Act, of the United States Information and Education Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1461(a))—

(1) the Director of the United States Information Agency shall make available to the Administrator of General Services a master copy of the film entitled "Thanksgiving in Peshawar"; and

(2) upon evidence that necessary United States rights and licenses have been secured and paid for by the person seeking domestic release of the film, the Administrator shall reimburse the Director for any expenses of the Agency in making that master copy available, shall deposit that film in the National Archives of the United States, and shall make copies of the film available for purchase and public viewing within the United States.

(b) Any reimbursement to the Director pursuant to this section shall be credited to the applicable appropriation of the United States Information Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

**TITLE III—BOARD FOR
INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING**

Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the "Board for International Broadcasting Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 302. Subparagraph (A) of section 8(a)(1) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2877(a)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) \$120,140,000 for the fiscal year 1983, \$115,702,000 for the fiscal year 1984, and \$121,371,000 for the fiscal year 1985; and"

SALARY OF THE RFE/RL PRESIDENT

Sec. 303. (a) The Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SALARY OF THE RFE/RL PRESIDENT

"Sec. 12. Funds made available under this Act to the RFE/RL, Inc., may not be used for the salary of the President of RFE/RL, Inc., at an annual rate in excess of the rate payable for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code."

(b) The amendment made by this section applies with respect to funds used for the salary of any President of RFE/RL, Inc., who is appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that the bill is being considered title by title, pursuant to the rule.

Are there amendments to title III?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title II, and I ask unanimous consent to return to title II of the bill for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I must object to returning to title II. I tried to open up this bill and I was stopped. Now that we have passed the title, the gentleman wants to go back.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I

fully understand. I was here on the floor. I was asked as a courtesy to go out to speak in the hall to people from the White House who were opposed to my amendment. I did that for a second, and while I was gone the opportunity to offer my amendment was eliminated.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman's amendment to title II? I do not understand.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. My amendment is to title II. It relates to the funding.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I have no idea what the amendment is, and I just hesitate.

Mr. Chairman, I must object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Are there amendments to title III?

The Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 401. This title may be cited as the "Inter-American Foundation Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985".

AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 402. Section 401(s)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (22 U.S.C. 290f(s)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "\$12,000,000 for the fiscal year 1982 and \$12,800,000 for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984 and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title IV?

The Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—THE ASIA FOUNDATION

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 501. This title may be cited as "The Asia Foundation Act".

FINDINGS

SEC. 502. The Congress finds that—

(1) The Asia Foundation, a private nonprofit corporation incorporated in 1954 in the State of California, has long been active in promoting Asian-American friendship and cooperation and in lending encouragement and assistance to Asians in their own efforts to develop more open, more just, and more democratic societies;

(2) The Asia Foundation's commitment to strengthening indigenous Asian institutions which further stable national development, constructive social change, equitable economic growth, and cooperative international relationships is fully consistent with and supportive of long-term United States interests in Asia;

(3) The Asia Foundation, as a private organization, is able to conduct programs in response to Asian initiatives that would be difficult or impossible for an official United States instrumentality, and it is in a position in Asia to respond quickly and flexibly to meet new opportunities;

(4) in recognition of the valuable contributions of The Asia Foundation to long-range United States foreign policy interests, the United States Government has, through a

variety of agencies, provided financial support for The Asia Foundation; and

(5) it is in the interest of the United States, and the further strengthening of Asian-American friendship and cooperation, to establish a more permanent mechanism for United States Government financial support for the ongoing activities of The Asia Foundation, while preserving the independent character of the Foundation.

GRANTS TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary of State shall make an annual grant to The Asia Foundation with the funds made available under section 504. Such grants shall be in general support of the Foundation's programs and operations. The terms and conditions of grants pursuant to this section shall be set forth in a grant agreement between the Secretary of State and The Asia Foundation.

(b) If funds made available to The Asia Foundation pursuant to this title or pursuant to any other provision of law are, with the permission of the head of the Federal agency making the funds available, invested by the Foundation or any of its subgrantees pending disbursement, the resulting interest is not required to be deposited in the United States Treasury if that interest is used for the purposes for which the funds were made available.

FUNDING

SEC. 504. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1983, \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1984, and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1985 for grants to The Asia Foundation pursuant to this title.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title V?

The Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 601. This title may be cited as the "National Endowment for Democracy Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

SEC. 602. (a) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation to be known as the National Endowment for Democracy (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Endowment").

(b) The Endowment will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government.

(c) The Endowment shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

(d) The Endowment shall have its principal offices in the District of Columbia.

PURPOSES OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 603. (a) The purposes of the Endowment are—

(1) to encourage free and democratic institutions throughout the world through private sector initiatives, including activities which promote the individual rights and freedoms, including internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, which are essential to the functioning of democratic institutions;

(2) to facilitate exchanges between United States private sector groups (especially the two major American political parties, labor, and business) and democratic groups abroad;

(3) to promote United States nongovernmental participation, especially through the two major American political parties, labor, business, and other private sector groups, in democratic training programs and democratic institution-building abroad;

(4) to strengthen democratic electoral processes abroad through timely measures in cooperation with indigenous democratic forces;

(5) to support the participation of the two major American political parties, labor, business, and other United States private sector groups in fostering cooperation with those abroad dedicated to the cultural values, institutions, and organizations of democratic pluralism; and

(6) to encourage the establishment and growth of democratic development in a manner consistent both with the broad concerns of United States national interests and with the specific requirements of the democratic groups in other countries which are aided by programs funded by the Endowment.

(b)(1) The Endowment may only provide funding for programs of private sector groups and may not carry out programs directly.

(2) The Endowment may provide funding only for programs which are consistent with the purposes set forth in this section.

(c) The Endowment and its grantees shall be subject to the appropriate oversight procedures of the Congress.

INCORPORATION OF THE ENDOWMENT

SEC. 604. (a) The following individuals shall serve as incorporators of the Endowment and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Endowment under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act: Honorable Dante B. Fascell, Honorable Charles Percy, Louis E. Martin, Sally Shelton, Olin Robison, John Richardson, Jr., Charles T. Manatt, Polly Baca Barragan, Frank Fahrenkopf, Lane Kirkland, Albert Shanker, William Brock, Charles H. Smith, Jr., Jay Van Andel, and Mrs. Legree Daniels.

(b) The Honorable Dante B. Fascell shall serve as chairman of the incorporators and as interim chairman of the Endowment until such time as a chairman is elected in accordance with the bylaws of the Endowment.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 605. (a) The Endowment shall be governed by a Board of Directors (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Board") composed of fifteen members. The initial members of the Board shall be the incorporators designated in section 604; and thereafter the Board shall be self-perpetuating, with members to be elected in accordance with the bylaws of the Endowment.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the Board shall not affect its powers.

(c) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of their membership on the Board, be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this title, be entitled (except in the case of members of the Board who are Members of Congress or officers or employees of the United States Government) to receive compensation at the daily equivalent of the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, they

may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

OFFICERS OF THE ENDOWMENT

Sec. 606. (a) The chief executive officer of the Endowment shall be a president appointed by the Board. The president of the Endowment shall administer the daily operations of the Endowment, reporting to the Board under guidelines and procedures to be established by the Board.

(b) The Endowment shall have such other officers and employees as the Board may determine.

(c) Officers of the Endowment shall be appointed on such terms, and for such terms or at the pleasure of the Board, as the Board may determine.

(d) Officers of the Endowment may not receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Endowment during the period of their employment by the Endowment.

NONPROFIT NATURE OF THE ENDOWMENT

Sec. 607. (a) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

(b) No part of the assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any member of the Board, any officer or employee of the Endowment, or any other individual, except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

RECORDS AND AUDIT OF THE ENDOWMENT AND THE RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE

Sec. 608. (a)(1) The accounts of the Endowment shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Endowment are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Endowment and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(2) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by section 609. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Endowment's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Endowment's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

(b)(1) The financial transactions of the Endowment for each fiscal year may be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Endowment are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, re-

ports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Endowment pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit; and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of the Endowment shall remain in possession and custody of the Endowment.

(2) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Endowment, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the Endowment at the time submitted to the Congress.

(c)(1) Each recipient of assistance under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(2) The Endowment, or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this title. The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

Sec. 609. Not later than December 31, of each year, the Endowment shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Endowment's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this title and may include such recommendations as the Endowment deems appropriate. The Board members and officers of the Endowment shall be available to testify before appropriate committees of the Congress with respect to such report, the report of any audit made by the Comptroller General pursuant to section 608, or any other matter which any such committee may determine.

FUNDING FOR THE ENDOWMENT

Sec. 610. (a) The Director of the United States Information Agency may make grants to the Endowment with funds appropriated to the Agency for the "Salaries and Expenses" account.

(b) Funds so granted may be used by the Endowment to carry out the purposes of this title, and otherwise applicable limitations on the purposes for which funds appropriated to the Agency may be used shall not apply to funds granted to the Endowment.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Sec. 611. Of the amounts made available to the Endowment for each of the fiscal years 1984 and 1985 to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act—

(1) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs;

(2) not less than \$5,000,000 shall be for the National Republican Institute for International Affairs;

(3) not less than \$13,800,000 shall be for the Free Trade Union Institute; and

(4) not less than \$2,500,000 shall be to support private enterprise development programs of the National Chamber Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 26, line 1, strike: "TITLE VI—NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY" and all that follow through page 35, line 9.

□ 1300

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, title VI deals with a very fine institution called the National Endowment for Democracy. It is a new idea and it has the potential to do a number of things. I think every Member of this body will strongly identify with the goals that are set forth. Most of us will be comfortable with the goals that they hope to advance.

I rise to object to the measure and urge this body to reject the spending of \$31.3 million in that effort for these reasons:

First of all, I am concerned about the cost. Our country has an enormous deficit. This is not the time to be adding programs of this kind.

Second, and I think far more important, I have some real concerns about this country taking public tax money and using it to subsidize the Republican and the Democratic Parties. Our democracy is a marvelous system. It is one that is tenuous. It is one that has not flowered everywhere in the world. To subsidize it with Federal funds, as this attempts to do, is a real danger to the whole concept of democracy itself.

True enough, our purpose is to advance democracy, but when you begin to have the political parties of this country dependent upon public dole, they become answerable to the Government. I think there is a real problem with subsidizing the various labor unions in their activities, not that they are not worthy enterprises, not that they are not important, not that they will not advance some important goals, but there is a real problem on making them dependent upon public funds and making them eventually become answerable to the Government.

Third, I am very concerned about the impact this has on the United States abroad. I would freely confess to my colleagues that other countries are involved in activities that are somewhat similar to this bill. One of the things that can make the activities of our labor unions overseas so effective in speaking out for democracy and free enterprise and for union rights is that they are not instruments of the Government but can be instruments of American workers.

To make the political parties and the labor unions and the others that will benefit from this largest instruments of the Federal Government will help to destroy their effectiveness. I am all for their involvement. I am all for their stated purpose. I am all for the development of democracy overseas, but this is not the way to do it. This is a way that will harm their effectiveness, harm the advancement of democracy, harm the speaking out for free enterprise by reducing the effectiveness of those instruments that we choose to subsidize.

I urge this body to reject this \$31.3 million attempt to interject the Federal Government into the private sector. There is great danger for the future of our own democracy if we choose these tools.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am glad that the gentleman supports the concepts and the purposes for which the language is in the bill, and I hasten to add that it is certainly in response to an administration initiative and very important. It has strong bipartisan support, I will say to the gentleman.

I need to clear up, however, some statements on the record. One is that the labor institute program has been an ongoing program for a long time. They have been receiving grants from the U.S. Government for over 30 years that I know of. For whatever reasons, and I think good ones, this administration wanted to show that allocation of funds and grants to American labor to be part of Project Democracy.

We agreed with that in the committee. We think that was a wise idea. And we also agreed, therefore, because this was a new concept for private enterprise through the chamber of commerce with their institute, that they would be part of Project Democracy in the manner in which the administration has also suggested.

As a matter of fact, we allocated even more money than the administration had first proposed for that purpose because we think it is absolutely essential to show to the world that private enterprise and labor are hand in hand in supporting overseas the concepts of free labor unions, private enterprise and market economy, and the things that we all believe in.

So we gave strong support to the administration on this matter.

Now, with respect to the political parties, I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor when the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) reported on his recent trip to Latin America and Venezuela and other places where they explored with counterpart groups the concept of the political parties engaging in Project Democracy on a regional basis. He reported that they were so enthusiastic that at long last a mechanism had been found whereby the political parties of the United States would be able to undertake, similarly to the political parties of other democracies, either individually or collectively with other organizations, as this regional concept seeks to do, the furtherance of the whole idea of a pluralistic political process, participation by parties, and whatever it is that we can contribute.

We think that is a very encouraging sign. In no way does it indicate that political parties domestically will in any sense draw on those funds. That is why there are separate institutes for that purpose, monitored very carefully, Mr. Chairman, in addition to other groups and organizations who have already indicated valuable ideas for the growth and the encouragement of democratic institutions abroad under Project Democracy which we think need to be encouraged and nurtured. That is the concept in here.

If title VI is stricken out, as the gentleman suggests, we do away with all of that. For the first time since I have been here, 28 years in the Congress, I had the golden opportunity to sit in a committee hearing and see the heads of both political parties, the leader of the American labor movement, and representatives of the executive branch and the private sector sit down and testify on behalf of the program that is laid out in title VI, the result of a Presidential initiative, and a thorough bipartisan study. They were unanimously behind this.

I can understand the gentleman's concern, but I think there is sufficient oversight both in the Congress and otherwise to insure that the gentleman's concerns will be thoroughly answered.

I would hope, therefore, that having had this colloquy, that he would be willing at this point to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I think he is an eloquent spokesman for the goals that I share.

It does seem to me that the subsidies by the Federal Government to the groups, albeit they are very good groups, is a problem. Part of my concern is the funding aspect, not so much the institute.

Mr. FASCELL. They were all in the budget, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal is the result of a lengthy, 6-month non-governmental research study by two major U.S. political parties, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, by labor and business—it involved Democrats, Republicans liberals, moderates and conservatives—to try to come up with a new private sector approach that will foster and strengthen our democratic values and institutions abroad.

Our Nation is engaged in a battle of ideas with authoritarian governments, and this is one of the better ways of highlighting what our Nation stands for. The Washington Post recently commented in an editorial on April 26, 1983, in which they highlighted "A Good Way to Export Democracy," and I quote from the last portion of that editorial:

But it is even more right and necessary to proceed. The endowment the sponsors have in mind is an incremental program of long-term institution-building, conducted out in the open and run not by government officials, but rather by the American private sector groups themselves. European political parties have long been in the business of helping their foreign compatriots. The record of effective international activity by the AFL-CIO and by many private foundations demonstrates that Americans can engage in it usefully, too.

□ 1310

I have a letter before me that was sent to the Members of Congress by the Democracy Program signed by Bill Brock and joined in by Charles T. Manatt, Lane Kirkland, and Frank J. Fahrenkopf, in which they state, and I quote:

The National Endowment for Democracy will fund recently-created separate Democratic and Republican party Institutes for International Affairs, the AFL-CIO supported Free Trade Union Institute, a Center for International Private Enterprise which would function under the auspices of the National Chamber Foundation, and other grantees. The AFL-CIO has a track record of three decades of providing assistance to democratic trade unionists abroad, and the business community has begun designing its Center to strengthen such international programs with its counterparts. As for the party Institutes, we note the Post's comment: "The most intriguing of these programs would help the American political parties reach out to their democratic allies abroad."

Mr. Chairman, I commend the President for initially suggesting this pro-

posal when he spoke before the Parliament in London not too long ago. I commend the leaders of business, labor, and the political parties who have joined together in this effort, and I urge my colleagues to support Project Democracy, an idea that will not only help strengthen our own institutions but will also present them in the most favorable light abroad. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Brown amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

□ 1320

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have responded. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 215, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—194

Andrews (TX)	Courter	Feighan
Anthony	Craig	Fields
Applegate	Crane, Daniel	Flippo
Archer	Crane, Phillip	Florio
AuCoin	Crockett	Forsythe
Barnard	D'Amours	Frank
Bartlett	Daniel	Glickman
Bates	Dannemeyer	Gradison
Bedell	Daschle	Gramm
Bethune	Daub	Gregg
Bevill	Dellums	Guarini
Boner	DeWine	Hall, Ralph
Breaux	Dickinson	Hall, Sam
Brown (CA)	Dorgan	Hamilton
Brown (CO)	Dreier	Hammerschmidt
Broyhill	Duncan	Hansen (UT)
Burton	Durbin	Harkin
Byron	Early	Hefner
Carney	Edgar	Hightower
Carper	Edwards (AL)	Hiler
Chappelle	Edwards (CA)	Hillis
Clay	Emerson	Hopkins
Coats	English	Hughes
Coleman (TX)	Erdreich	Hunter
Conable	Evans (IA)	Jacobs

Jenkins	Mikulski	Sisisky	Ritter	Siljander	Valentine
Johnson	Miller (CA)	Skeen	Robinson	Simon	Vander Jagt
Jones (OK)	Miller (OH)	Slattery	Rodino	Skelton	Vandergriff
Jones (TN)	Mineta	Smith (NE)	Roe	Smith (FL)	Waxman
Kaptur	Molinaro	Smith, Denny	Rose	Smith (IA)	Wheat
Kasich	Montgomery	Smith, Robert	Rostenkowski	Smith (NJ)	Whitehurst
Kastenmeier	Moody	Snowe	Roth	Solarz	Whitley
Kennelly	Moore	Snyder	Roukema	Solomon	Williams (MT)
Kindness	Moorhead	Spratt	Roybal	Spence	Williams (OH)
Kogovsek	Morrison (CT)	Stagers	Russo	St Germain	Wolf
Kramer	Myers	Stark	Sabo	Stangeland	Wright
LaFalce	Nichols	Stenholm	Sawyer	Stokes	Wylie
Leach	Nielson	Studds	Scheuer	Stratton	Yates
Leath	Oakar	Stump	Schneider	Tallon	Yatron
Leland	Olin	Sundquist	Schulze	Thomas (CA)	Young (AK)
Levine	Ottinger	Swift	Schumer	Torres	Young (MO)
Levitas	Oxley	Synar	Shaw	Torricelli	Young (FL)
Loeffler	Packard	Tauke	Shelby	Towns	Zablocki
Long (LA)	Panetta	Tauzin	Sikorski	Udall	
Lott	Patman	Taylor			
Lowery (CA)	Patterson	Thomas (GA)			
Lowry (WA)	Pease	Traxler			
Lujan	Rahall	Vento			
Lungren	Ratchford	Volkmer			
Mack	Ray	Vucanovich			
MacKay	Regula	Walgren			
Madigan	Roberts	Walker			
Marlenee	Roemer	Watkins			
Martin (IL)	Rogers	Weaver			
Martin (NC)	Rowland	Weber			
Martin (NY)	Rudd	Weiss			
McCain	Savage	Whittaker			
McCandless	Schaefer	Whitten			
McCloskey	Schroeder	Winn			
McCollum	Seiberling	Wirth			
McCurdy	Sensenbrenner	Wise			
McDonald	Shannon	Wortley			
McEwen	Sharp	Wyden			
McGrath	Shumway	Zschau			
McKernan	Shuster				

NOES—215

Ackerman	Edwards (OK)	Levin
Addabbo	Erlenborn	Lewis (CA)
Akaka	Evans (IL)	Lewis (FL)
Albosta	Fascell	Lipinski
Alexander	Fazio	Livingston
Anderson	Ferraro	Long (MD)
Annunzio	Fiedler	Luken
Aspin	Fish	Lundine
Barnes	Foglietta	Markey
Bennett	Foley	Marriott
Bereuter	Ford (TN)	Matsui
Berman	Fowler	Mavroules
Biaggi	Frost	Mazzoli
Bilirakis	Fuqua	McDade
Billey	Garcia	McHugh
Boehliert	Gaydos	McKinney
Boggs	Gejdenson	McNulty
Bonior	Gekas	Mica
Bonker	Gephardt	Michel
Borski	Gibbons	Minish
Bosco	Gilman	Mitchell
Boucher	Gingrich	Moakley
Boxer	Gonzalez	Mollohan
Britt	Goodling	Morrison (WA)
Brooks	Gore	Mrazek
Broomfield	Gray	Murphy
Bryant	Green	Murtha
Campbell	Gunderson	Natcher
Carr	Hall (IN)	Neal
Chandler	Hall (OH)	Nelson
Chappell	Hance	Nowak
Clarke	Harrison	O'Brien
Clinger	Hatcher	Oberstar
Coelho	Hawkins	Obey
Collins	Hertel	Ortiz
Conte	Holt	Owens
Cooper	Horton	Parris
Corcoran	Howard	Pashayan
Coughlin	Hoyer	Penny
Coyne	Huckaby	Pepper
Davis	Hutto	Perkins
de la Garza	Hyde	Petri
Derrick	Ireland	Pickle
Dicks	Kazen	Porter
Dingell	Kemp	Price
Dixon	Kildee	Pritchard
Donnelly	Kostmayer	Pursell
Dowdy	Lagomarsino	Quillen
Downey	Lantos	Rangel
Dwyer	Latta	Reid
Dymally	Lehman (CA)	Richardson
Dyson	Lehman (FL)	Ridge
Eckart	Lent	Rinaldo

NOT VOTING—23

Andrews (NC)	Ford (MI)	Jones (NC)
Badham	Franklin	Kolter
Bateman	Frenzel	Lloyd
Bellenson	Hansen (ID)	Martinez
Boland	Hartnett	Paul
Cheney	Heftel	Wilson
Coleman (MO)	Hubbard	Woipe
Conyers	Jeffords	

□ 1340

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Badham for, with Mr. Frenzel against.
Mr. Bateman for, with Mr. Franklin against.

Messrs. HOYER, DONNELLY, CHANDLER, LATTA, LENT, LEWIS of California, PASHAYAN, and THOMAS of California changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. JOHNSON, and Messrs. WEAVER, BARTLETT, KINDNESS, ERDREICH, PATTERSON, FEIGHAN, VOLKMER, LELAND, COLEMAN of Texas, WIRTH, MOODY, MACKEY, BROWN of California, MCCURDY, WYDEN, MORRISON of Connecticut, JONES of Oklahoma, STUMP, EARLY, CRAIG, and HEFNER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

□ 1350

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out something about this bill that I think is rather important and unfortunately rather unique. I commend the committee very much for this.

This bill contains appropriations for fiscal year 1985. That means it will be up to date come September. It will be one of the very few authorizations around here that will be enacted on schedule, most of the authorizations now being proposed for enactment are for the 1984 fiscal year starting in October. The appropriations proposal for 1984 was presented to the Congress as required by the Constitution last January and there were no authorized

guidelines in place upon which these proposals had to be based. If the authorization for 1985 is not enacted before October 1, the Department does not have an authorization to go by as a guideline. They can send up appropriation requests based upon imaginary authorizations that they are asking for and make their appropriations based on a program that does not exist and that is a principal reason we are getting into the mess we are in here now.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Wisconsin and others who worked on this bill for putting 1985 appropriations into this bill and being one of the few proposals to be on time.

Now this bill also contains 1983 authorizations. It is too late for 1983 authorizations. Not only 1983 authorizations, but 1984 authorizations should have been enacted last September.

Had the 1984 authorization been passed by last October 1, the Department submitting appropriations requests for 1984 would have had to submit the request based upon that authorization, instead of some phony request based upon an imaginary authorization they are requesting.

So this bill contains a very important principle, and it will be one of the very few that really is on time.

Seventy-seven percent of the appropriation bill that the subcommittee I chair has pending is not reauthorized. Think of that, 77 percent of the money in that bill came up here in requests from the administration without an authorization. Some of those programs and Departments such as the Justice Department have not been authorized for 2 years. It is not always the fault of the authorizing committees. In the case of the Judiciary Committee, for example, the bill passed the House, but it was not passed in the Senate. Unless we require these authorization bills to carry 1985 authorizations this year and to get at least up to date, we are never going to catch up.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We certainly appreciate the gentleman's comments. As the gentleman knows, this is the third time we have had a 2-year authorization. As I stated in earlier debate, this is certainly the proper way for the Congress to operate. It gives the Foreign Affairs Committee a better opportunity for oversight and certainly the Appropriations Committee, dealing with the funding, has a better opportunity to act expeditiously and under the guidelines set forth in authorizing legislation.

I thank the gentleman for his comments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 27, line 4, strike "especially the two major American political parties," and on page 27, line 15, strike "the two major American political parties;".

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply strikes the money going to the two political parties. My feeling is that it is inappropriate for us to use taxpayer money in that regard.

I will not belabor the House' time any further with an argument on that point. I think it is a very straightforward issue. Should we end up funding the political parties in this manner?

I would urge the House to adopt the amendment and save the money involved.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that political parties be involved in this process. That is what the President's foreign policy initiative is all about, to bring about direct relationships between labor and private sector groups.

Chairman Fahrenkopf, the Republican national chairman, when he appeared before our House subcommittee on this measure in April of this year—

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman is talking now in the context of domestic operations by the political parties in any sense. The language of the legislation does not provide any funding for any domestic operations by political parties. We are talking here about a capability overseas, through a separate organization of political parties in an international institute in both cases. These institutes would give them a capability similar to what other political parties now have, to discuss, to meet, and to exchange ideas on the processes of a republican form of government or a democratic form of government or a pluralistic society with the right of political participation.

We are not talking about any kind of domestic participation.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the chairman for clarifying the extent of the involvement of the political parties.

Mr. Chairman, for my colleague's edification, permit me to read Republican Chairman Fahrenkopf's brief statement when he appeared before our subcommittee. He said:

For its part the Republican Party anticipates and supports fully the creation of the

National Endowment for Democracy and its related institutions. We believe that we as Republicans have a message for the world, both the developed and non-developed regions. We stand by our basic principles and philosophy as our guide to the vision of a better America and a freer and more prosperous world. Where appropriate we hope to express that vision abroad while at the same time recognizing that ours is not the only voice to be heard.

I appeal to my colleagues to support Project Democracy and to vote in opposition to the Brown amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. In all reality let me say to the gentleman that in a time when we are trying to balance budgets and have great concern for the tremendous deficits that we are experiencing that this is a priority that could wait a year or two until we are in better shape.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and that of the gentleman from Florida.

It seems to me that this is perhaps the most important thing in this bill. I mentioned in my remarks in general debate that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARNES) and I, representing our political parties a couple of weeks ago, went down to Venezuela and met with our counterparts in the two major political parties in Venezuela. They were very interested in this program. They thought it could be very helpful throughout this hemisphere, indeed, throughout the world. The only question they had was, "Why are you waiting so long to do this? Other countries have been doing it for a long time. The West Germans, the French, many other countries are doing it now."

And as the gentleman from New York pointed out, this is something that is very, very high on the agenda, very, very high in the priorities of both of our major political parties.

I would hope that if we really mean what we say, and I am sure we do, about trying to create and build democracy, to maintain it where it exists, to help it along in places like El Salvador where it is off to a slow, but I think a sure start, we do have to have this kind of program, this kind of encouragement and certainly with not turning down the funding for the AFL-CIO and for the chamber of commerce and private industry I think it is even more important that the political parties be recognized in this way that this work can be carried on.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

□ 1400

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to point out that, for a nation that spends \$230 billion on the capacity to destroy, the idea of spending \$30 million to build people's capacity to create and to create free societies is a darn good one, and I submit that we have waited far too long for the effort.

I commend the gentleman on this program and the administration and the Republicans and the Democrats who support this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to yield to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not true that this program is to provide democratic training programs and democratic institution building abroad? And the purpose is to strengthen democratic electoral processes abroad through timely measures and cooperation with indigenous democratic forces?

So the question is: Do we want countries that are developing democracies to be assisted, or do we want totalitarian governments in these countries that we are interested in?

Is that not the point?

Mr. GILMAN. That is precisely the point and I commend the gentleman for stressing this program's objective.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. And if the Members vote for the gentleman's amendment, they will be supporting totalitarian, undemocratic, nondemocratic countries.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his supportive remarks.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman's amendment would carry and that it would be expanded to take out the AFL-CIO, because the last time they sent people to El Salvador to promote democracy, they were murdered, and the government still has not prosecuted the case.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out to my colleagues that the political foundations

in West Germany, which now collectively receive over \$150 million, have been engaged in a democracy program for several years. We have a lot of catching up to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BARNES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) said earlier, I had the privilege of representing the Democratic Party of the United States, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) represented the Republican Party of the United States in recent discussions with political leaders.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. BARNES and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILMAN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BARNES. As I was saying, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) represented the Republican Party, represented Chairman Fahrenkopf, and I represented Chairman Manatt at recent meetings with representatives of political parties in Caracas, Venezuela.

As my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO) said a few moments ago, the questions that we were asked about this program by our friends in democratic parties throughout the hemisphere was not, "Why are you doing this? How are you going to do it?" The questions were, really, "Why have you not done this sooner? Why has not the United States, the bastion of democracy in the world, been promoting democracy through contacts with friendly political parties around the world, the way the Germans have been doing, the French and others have been doing quite successfully?"

It is far past time that our country undertakes this kind of effort.

I say to my friends on the Democratic side that this has the total support of the Democratic National Committee. I talked to Chairman Manatt about this just within the last 3 or 4 days. He is totally supportive of this effort. I am sure if he were here on the floor of the House, he would urge all Democrats, just as Chairman Fahrenkopf would urge all Republicans, to defeat this amendment.

There is a lot of work that has gone into this program already by the Democratic National Committee, as by the Republican National Committee, and it is important that the amendment be defeated and that we get forward with the program.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his support and his remarks.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that when we in the United States talk about democracy, we understand what that concept means. We have a two-party system. We have had it for many, many hundreds of years. We understand not only the terms but the practical effect. But when you talk about democracy in the rest of the world, they do not understand it in the same way. They have not had it. Their education has not been such that they understand it.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I think what we have here is really an abuse of judgment.

Political parties are not governments. I think everyone in this room ought to understand the predicament that this society of ours is going to be placed in. If, for instance, you take the Republican National Chairman, a Senator from our side and, let us say, Senator HELMS goes and says, "Let's give \$100,000 or \$200,000 to Mr. D'Aubisson in El Salvador." And let us say that someone else on our side comes and says, "Let's give \$100,000 or \$200,000 to Mr. Duarte in El Salvador."

They are going to be making foreign policy judgments. This is a predicament that our national chairmen should not be placed in.

As far as the Venezuelan model that has been suggested to us, does anyone in this room know how much money Venezuela spends on politics? They spend more than the United States of America. They do not need United States money. We are going to be placing ourselves in political jeopardy in this country by identifying with one side or another in foreign disputes. That is nutty.

What happens, for example, if the Republican Party gives to one party in a foreign country, the other party wins the elections, the Republican Party wins here, suddenly you have got the President of the Republican Party dealing with an opponent that he tried to defeat. That is nuts. That is why we have government-to-government relations. We should not be getting involved in political parties in foreign countries. At least we should not be getting involved in a party-to-party sense.

I think the gentleman from Colorado has a very sensible amendment. I certainly urge its adoption.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I would just like to take a short time to speak in opposition to the amendment.

I have just heard the worst case scenario of anything I have ever heard in my life, in terms of setting up straw men, scares, and concern. And I know they are serious, I know they are genuine, because I know my colleague on the committee, and I have worked with him for a long time.

But for his scenario to actually occur, you would have to assume that the Congress has given up all oversight. You would have to assume that the executive branch, whatever administration is in power, has no concept and cares less about what is going on, because this money is not automatic. It has to be budgeted, it has to go through the agency, it has to be authorized, it has to be appropriated. And there is continual oversight. It assumes that nobody will know what is happening.

In other words, to carry out the worst case scenario which was just presented, you would have to assume that everybody in the whole governmental process in the United States suddenly went bananas and closed down everything and decided to go off on their own.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is impossible under the constraints of our own Government and under our society as we know it.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa. I know the gentleman is very much concerned about this.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I personally do not know of any expertise that either the Republican or the Democratic National Committees have in dealing with foreign affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, I will say to the gentleman, in response to just that aspect, I am not sure they are experts either. But they represent our two major political parties in this country. They have some expertise. They either help the administration get elected or they help the administration get unelected. They have some reason for being.

I just cannot understand why anybody would want to denigrate either political party. I do not think they have all the wisdom in the world, but I do not think that both political parties are totally composed of idiots.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further on that point, the next problem we have in this issue is that clearly there is going to be an overhead expense.

What happens if the Democratic Party takes \$1 million, the Republican Party half, or vice versa? You have got

a real problem there with suddenly the Congress funding money for four parties.

□ 1410

Beyond that, we have the issue of oversight. The gentleman mentioned that Congress will have oversight. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that a Democratic chairman should have oversight over Frank Fahrenkopf, or vice versa? I mean, we are looking at individual judgments. If we are going to give these people money, we have to give them the right to expend their money. If we are not going to give them money, then we do not have that problem.

Mr. FASCELL. We are going to give them the right to expend the money, I will say to the gentleman, within the framework of the guidelines that are laid down in the bill and only for the purposes therein. They are subject to internal audit, they are subject to external audit, they are subject to GAO review, and they are subject to review by Congress.

If they do not want to do that, they do not have to take the money. If the Government, any administration, does not want to come forward with the amount of money in the budget, they do not have to do it. This is not automatic. If the Committee on Appropriations does not want to appropriate the money, they do not have to appropriate the money.

I think we have plenty of safeguards in it and I can draw up as many scarecrows as anybody, but I am going to assume that, despite the strong spread in the difference of the political spectrum which is obvious in this House from right to left, there is a majority of reasonable people in any part of the political spectrum who will see to it that this thing is going to work properly for the benefit of the country, not for the benefit of a political party.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my Republican colleagues, first of all, that Bill Brock, when he was national chairman of our party, went over to Europe and studied the European system that this is based on. If any of my colleagues have ever had any contact with members of the German Bundestag or the parliaments over there, they know that they come over here or meet with us and they send people to be able to discuss foreign affairs under the umbrella of organizations like this. They have less public hassle because of it.

If we want to put our heads in the sand and pretend that foreign affairs is unimportant, then vote for this amendment. But if Bill Brock was

right, and if President Reagan, who told the Parliament in England when he was there, that this is the thing that he supports, then you should forget about them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri and by unanimous consent, Mr. FASCELL was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Our present chairman testified in favor of this, and I would suggest that we just pause and consider exactly the effect of the amendment.

The reason we are having trouble in the world and the understanding of the American people, and even our own political parties is, we do not know anything about it in most cases. I hear a lot of opposition coming from people on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has this before them every day. The rest of us do not. The rest of the people back home do not. The local and State officials do not have the opportunity of serving on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and knowing all that.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 136, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

AYES—267

Akaka	Coats	English
Albosta	Coleman (TX)	Erdreich
Anderson	Collins	Evans (IA)
Andrews (NC)	Conable	Feighan
Andrews (TX)	Cooper	Fiedler
Anthony	Craig	Fields
Applegate	Crane, Daniel	Flippo
Archer	Crane, Philip	Florio
AuCoin	Crockett	Foglietta
Barnard	D'Amours	Foley
Bartlett	Daniel	Forsythe
Bates	Dannemeyer	Frank
Bedell	Daschle	Frost
Bereuter	Daub	Gaydos
Bethune	Davis	Gekas
Bevill	Dellums	Gephardt
Boehlert	DeWine	Glickman
Boner	Dicks	Gore
Bonior	Donnelly	Gradison
Borski	Dorgan	Gramm
Breaux	Dowdy	Green
Brown (CA)	Downey	Gregg
Brown (CO)	Dreier	Guarini
Broyhill	Duncan	Hall (IN)
Bryant	Durbin	Hall (OH)
Burton	Dwyer	Hall, Ralph
Byron	Dyson	Hall, Sam
Carney	Eckart	Hamilton
Carper	Edgar	Hammerschmidt
Carr	Edwards (AL)	Hansen (UT)
Chandler	Edwards (CA)	Harkin
Chappie	Edwards (OK)	Harrison
Clay	Emerson	Hatcher

Hawkins	McHugh	Shelby
Hefner	McKernan	Shumway
Hertel	McNulty	Shuster
Hightower	Mikulski	Sikorski
Hiler	Miller (CA)	Sisisky
Hillis	Miller (OH)	Skeen
Hopkins	Mineta	Skelton
Hughes	Minish	Slattery
Hunter	Mitchell	Smith (NE)
Jacobs	Molinari	Smith, Denny
Jenkins	Montgomery	Smith, Robert
Jones (OK)	Moody	Snowe
Kaptur	Moore	Snyder
Kasich	Moorhead	Solomon
Kastenmeier	Morrison (CT)	Spence
Kazen	Mrazek	Spratt
Kennelly	Murphy	Staggers
Kildee	Murtha	Stark
Kogovsek	Myers	Stenholm
Kramer	Natcher	Stokes
LaFalce	Nichols	Stratton
Latta	Nielson	Studds
Leach	Oakar	Stump
Leath	Olin	Sundquist
Lehman (CA)	Ottinger	Swift
Leland	Oxley	Synar
Levine	Packard	Tauke
Levitas	Panetta	Tauzin
Loeffler	Patman	Taylor
Long (MD)	Patterson	Thomas (GA)
Lott	Pease	Towns
Lowery (CA)	Penny	Traxler
Lowry (WA)	Perkins	Valentine
Lujan	Porter	Vandergriff
Luken	Rahall	Vento
Lundine	Ratchford	Volkmer
Lungren	Ray	Vucanovich
Mack	Richardson	Walgren
MacKay	Ridge	Walker
Madigan	Roberts	Watkins
Markey	Roe	Weaver
Marlenee	Roemer	Weber
Martin (IL)	Rogers	Weiss
Martin (NC)	Rose	Whittaker
Martin (NY)	Roukema	Whitten
Matsui	Rowland	Winn
Mazzoli	Roybal	Wirth
McCain	Savage	Wise
McCandless	Sawyer	Wolpe
McCloskey	Schaefer	Wortley
McCollum	Schroeder	Wyden
McCurdy	Schumer	Yates
McDade	Seiberling	Yatron
McDonald	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
McEwen	Shannon	Young (FL)
McGrath	Sharp	Young (MO)

NOES—136

Ackerman	Evans (IL)	Marriott
Addabbo	Fascell	McKinney
Alexander	Fazio	Mica
Annunzio	Ferraro	Michel
Aspin	Fowler	Moakley
Barnes	Fuqua	Mollohan
Bennett	Garcia	Morrison (WA)
Berman	Gejdenson	Neal
Biaggi	Gibbons	Nelson
Bilirakis	Gilman	Nowak
Billey	Gingrich	O'Brien
Boggs	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Bonker	Goodling	Obey
Bosco	Gunderson	Ortiz
Boucher	Hance	Owens
Boxer	Holt	Parris
Britt	Horton	Pashayan
Brooks	Howard	Pepper
Broomfield	Hoyer	Petri
Campbell	Huckaby	Pickle
Chappell	Hutto	Price
Clarke	Hyde	Pritchard
Clinger	Ireland	Quillen
Coelho	Johnson	Rangel
Coleman (MO)	Jones (NC)	Reid
Conte	Kemp	Rinaldo
Corcoran	Kindness	Ritter
Coughlin	Kostmayer	Robinson
Courter	Lagomarsino	Rodino
Coyne	Lehman (FL)	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Lent	Roth
Derrick	Levin	Rudd
Dickinson	Lewis (CA)	Russo
Dingell	Lewis (FL)	Sabo
Dixon	Lipinski	Scheuer
Dymally	Livingston	Schneider
Erlenborn	Long (LA)	Schulze

Shaw	Tallon	Whitley
Siljander	Thomas (CA)	Williams (MT)
Simon	Torres	Wolf
Smith (FL)	Torricelli	Wright
Smith (IA)	Udall	Wylie
Smith (NJ)	Vander Jagt	Zablocki
Solarz	Waxman	Zschau
St Germain	Wheat	
Stangeland	Whitehurst	

NOT VOTING—29

Badham	Franklin	Lantos
Bateman	Frenzel	Lloyd
Bellenson	Gray	Martinez
Boland	Hansen (ID)	Mavroules
Cheney	Hartnett	Paul
Conyers	Hefelt	Pursell
Early	Hubbard	Regula
Fish	Jeffords	Williams (OH)
Ford (MI)	Jones (TN)	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Kolter	

□ 1420

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Badham for, with Mr. Frenzel against.
Mr. Bateman for, with Mr. Franklin against.

Mr. DERRICK and Mr. RUDD changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ALBOSTA, PERKINS, SCHUMER, RICHARDSON, STARK and KILDEE, Ms. FIEDLER, and Messrs. MATSUI, BEVILL, BONIOR of Michigan, HERTEL of Michigan, AKAKA, CARR, and LATTA changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1430

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITTEN was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask my colleagues to give me their attention?

I would like to tell you some of the problems that I see and to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee for the 2-year authorization recommended in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think this committee has made a significant forward step by its action for good legislation and orderly procedure.

I have spoken for many years about the advantages of 2-year or multiyear authorizations. I know in recent years, we have had to rely to a great extent on continuing resolutions. One of the contributing factors has been the growth in the number of annual authorization bills and the lack of enacted authorizations.

A continuing resolution is a hybrid. It can be both an authorization and an appropriation.

Of course, another contributing factor in the need for all encompass-

ing continuing resolutions has been the delays in the budget resolutions.

But if you do not have an authorization, both sides of every controversy and every committee will come to our committee and insist their side is going to win out and that their side is right.

So I am saying that unless we authorize for 2 or more years, each year it will be more difficult for the average legislative committee to get its bills through in time for us to bring up appropriations in time for us to meet our obligations as a Congress and avoid reliance on continuing resolutions.

I say again that each side in controversy in a legislative committee thinks they are going to win and it leaves us trying to decide what to do. In a continuing resolution, in particular, if there is no authorization, we are subject to pressures from both sides to take sides on the issue.

Talk to officials in the executive branch and they will urge you to provide 2-year authorizations so they can do some forward planning. May I say to you that right now in the executive branch they are busy working on 1985 appropriations, next year's programs, when we have not even got many 1984 authorizations passed yet.

So I just hope that with the support of the leadership we can persuade you, our friends on the legislative committees, to authorize for 2 years at a time.

We want guidelines. We want the benefit of having the authorizations enacted before we move on appropriation bills. We do not want the country looking at us like we are in chaos.

So the answer to it, I think, is the action taken by this committee—the multiyear authorization. I hope more committees, all the legislative committees, will take notice of this action and follow suit. If so, we will do more to straighten out the operations of the Congress than anything else I can think of.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the chairman for yielding.

I want to strongly support his statements with respect to the problem that we face, both in the Appropriations Committee and the authorizing committees. There is not any question about it, that under the situation we now find ourselves, if we continue with the annual appropriation process, because of the annual authorization process, rather, we will always be behind. The very dynamics of the budget situation the way it is now, we will never be on time. We will always be faced with the problems of appropriation bills prior to authorization bills and we will always be a year behind.

The only satisfactory solution from an authorizing standpoint is the one that we bring here today, in our judgment, which is a 2-year authorization bill.

In order to complete that cycle, I might say to the chairman, that is the reason I asked the gentleman to yield, not only to indicate my agreement, but to say that what we will probably have to do is come in next year with another 2-year bill to just one time get ahead of the cycle. If we can once do that, this whole process will fall into place. If we do not do that, we are going to be plagued with the kind of troubles that we have at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I say to my colleague, he has certainly set an excellent precedent that all other legislative committees should follow, and I hope will.

May I say, we welcome authorizations, because it makes our job far more simple, far more effective, and the effect on the executive branch of the Government will be tremendous in that they will have legislative guidance for forward planning for future operations and future budgets.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman can get the suggestion across to the Budget Committee where we can get a 2-year budget, we will have it whipped.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend.

□ 1440

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF COLORADO

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado: On page 35, strike lines 1 through 4.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment. It should have been included in the first amendment. All it does is remove the reservations of the money for the Democratic and Republican Parties. We have already voted on the substance of this issue.

This really should have been included in the previous amendment and I ask unanimous consent for its adoption.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is far from technical.

The first amendment simply removed reference out of the statement of purposes with respect to political parties.

Now what the gentleman seeks to do is eliminate the earmarking.

It is one thing to limit the political parties to whatever it is people want to limit them to. It is quite another thing to strike out the earmarking of the funds for the program.

I would suggest that what we need to do is vote this amendment down.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not mean to mislead the body in any way. My impression was when we voted last time we voted on the issue before the body of whether or not we wanted this public funding to go to the political parties.

The chairman, of course, is correct. I do not mean to mislead him in any way. If he wishes a vote I will withdraw my request for unanimous consent. I really was trying to save the time of the body.

This amendment simply removes the earmarking of money and the language simply is not less than \$5 million for the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and not less than \$5 million for the National Republican Institute for International Affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the gentleman's intention. I just simply wanted the record to be clear.

I think our colleagues know what they are voting on and I do not have to explain it to them. But I just wanted the record to be clear that the first amendment simply dealt with the reference to the political parties and the purposes of the organizations.

What this amendment does is strike out the earmarking of the funds which is an entirely different matter.

I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. I thank the Chairman. He is absolutely correct, and I urge an "aye" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON: On page 34, strike out line 22 and all that follows through line 9 on page 35.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, we have cut the funds for the Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the Republican Institute for International Affairs, and I think that the Free Trade Union Institute as well as the National Chamber Foundation will be viewed by our friends around the world as an extension or an arm of the Federal Government.

While I am very much in favor of them being involved in selling democracy around the world as individual institutions, I, like my colleague, who voted to cut the previous funding, feel like it is improper for Federal funds to be used for this purpose.

For us to be consistent I believe that we must also cut the funds for the Free Trade Union Institute as well as the National Chamber Foundation. I think that this amendment should pass to be consistent with the previous amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, sometimes it is fun when the blood begins to flow to let it flow freely. But I want to be sure that my colleagues understand exactly what this amendment does in terms of removing the earmarking.

The American Free Labor Institute, a program which has been operating for some 30 years, is one of the most effective programs speaking for the United States that this country has. They have been grantees of the U.S. Government for a long period of time.

They are grantees. They are not an arm of the Government. The gentleman is incorrect. They are totally independent.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. My question is: If the funds of U.S. taxpayers are used and we are involved in some kind of an action some place in the world, whether it is the Chamber Foundation or the Labor Institute, would that not be viewed as an action of the Federal Government, just as though it were from the Republican Institute or the Democratic Institute that we talked about earlier?

Mr. FASCELL. It might be viewed that way by the gentleman who speaks, and that is unfortunate, in my judgment. I suppose that overseas there are a lot of people who look at everything and assume that it is the U.S. Government, whether it is a private corporation, a university, or some other institute.

But it just so happens that the American Free Labor Institute is not a governmental agency. It has been operating a long time, and yes, it does get funds from the U.S. Government.

Mr. BURTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Not right now. Let me just finish my statement. The gentleman has had his shot.

I just want to make sure that everybody understands what they are voting on and then they can have their field day. If you want to knock out the money for labor, that is fine, and if you want to sacrifice the Chamber of Commerce because you think you are getting at labor, so be it. Those are the politics of it. You can play it any way you like.

The fact is you will be destroying an outstanding program under the American Free Labor Institute.

On the other side, the administration thought it would be valuable, and

the committee agreed almost unanimously that it would be worthwhile to have a similar institute for the private sector and the free enterprise concept.

I want to tell you that that was not an easy thing to do in light of the number of people who said that we should not do this kind of thing. But eventually their hesitancy was overcome because they could see the benefit of this of encouragement of a private sector effort, including the free enterprise concept, in the United States. The distance that would remain would be this: that the organizations that would do it would be from the private sector, yes, the private sector institute would be a grantee of the U.S. Government. But it would be a grantee at arms' length. I think that makes a great, big difference.

I think that to vote for this amendment and destroy those two programs, one of which has been in operation for 30 years, another which has an outstanding potential, would be a sheer disaster. I hope my colleagues will vote against the amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, we pride ourselves as being consistent in this body, at least most of the time. I believe for us to strike the funding for the Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the Republican Institute for International Affairs and leave in there at taxpayers' expense funding for these other two institutes is completely inconsistent. If we are going to strike funding for the first two institutes the only logical thing to do would be to strike funding for the latter two institutes as well.

Mr. Chairman, I am very supportive of both the Free Trade Union Institute and the National Chamber Foundation and I support their efforts to export democracy and freedom. While I am in favor of these organizations and their efforts in this area, I do not feel we should be using our tax dollars to achieve their goals under the guise of private organizations.

I view this as counterproductive and believe this leads to the view that these organizations would be an extension of the U.S. Government and they would then possibly lose their effectiveness.

It would be far superior to allow the free trade unions to do what they did in Poland to help Solidarity. Had they been using Federal Government funds it would have looked like the U.S. Government was imposing its will upon Poland.

We must remember that we have a \$200 billion deficit for this year alone. Funding these two institutes will add \$16.3 million in new expenditures.

I wholeheartedly support President Ronald Reagan's efforts to export freedom and democracy around the world, but I do not believe we should be funding private organizations with tax dollars to do it.

These organizations should use private funds to accomplish these objectives. They will then be viewed as concerned organizations trying to promote freedom and democracy instead of tools of the U.S. Government which our adversaries could discredit.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this issue for many reasons. One is that I have enough problems dealing with agriculture.

But the previous vote and this vote that will be coming have me greatly concerned because I have been privately telling my colleague from Florida of my support for the endeavor which he and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have initiated in this Endowment for Democracy.

□ 1450

Mr. Chairman, I just came home and almost everything that was mentioned to me was related to Central America, to what is happening in El Salvador. Well, I hate to tell you this, but we may have lost El Salvador 20 years ago; but now our concern is are we going to send troops? Are we going to send military assistance? This is the answer to that.

We could be saving ourselves tremendous headaches; we could be saving ourselves millions of dollars; we could be saving lives in this country, if we but plant a small seed of democratic institutions, of appealing from an irresponsible government, of, yes, union work, chamber of commerce work.

What this is intending to do is bring our concept of 200 years, thank God that it caught 200 years ago. But we are dealing with countries 25 years old, 40 years old, 50 years old, where the seed did not sprout like it did in our country.

The other camp spends \$30 million in 1 month, in one country, my colleagues. They send hundreds of teachers, doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, all indoctrinated in their philosophy, their ideology. It pains me and shames me to think that we are playing here with \$30 million that could save countless thousands of lives. Our system for other people in the world; let the democratic institutions tell it; this is a mystery to them how we can differ in our country, how we can have a Republican President, a Democratic House, a Republican Senate; this is the mystery. This is what they want explained. How can you make it work? Well, how can you make it work but

send the people who make it work? Not the CIA, not the bureaucrats, not the State Department; send the chamber of commerce, the doctor, the lawyer, the engineer, the university professor. Do not let the CIA disseminate what democracy is. Let the people who make it work do it. Here, \$30 million; \$30 million; they spend \$30 million in one country, in the time we blink an eye. So, please, I know there are other amendments to come, but let me tell you from one who has been there, from one who talks to them, from one who talks to them in their language, the mystery to them is how does this American system work? I say teach them, let them know by the people who are making it work.

All we are doing is giving them a few dollars, a few dollars to assist them in that effort.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the gentleman for the remarks he has made. They are right on target. I want to suggest that the glory of this country is that it gives the lie to the Marxist theory that labor and management are in a class struggle, when both of those important elements of our society and our economy and political system can work together to advance the cause of a free democracy in those countries where they are being besieged by Marxism and Marxist dogma that the class struggle is the only way for progress.

I think it is very important that these private agencies of both labor and management present a common front and spread the message that democracy and capitalism work together hand in hand to elevate the improvement and change.

I think this amendment, though well-intentioned, is wrong and moves in the wrong direction.

(On request of Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma and by unanimous request, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I understand very well the purpose of the amendment and I sympathize with the motives that prompted the Member to offer this amendment. But it is very unfortunate.

Labor unions in particular have been very staunch and effective advocates of freedom in opposition to international communism around the world. In the international arena, organized labor has been an effective ally of ev-

everything that we are trying to do to protect the security of this country and our allies.

I understand the gentleman's frustration, but I believe if you are really concerned about the spread of international communism, this amendment would be counterproductive and I urge its defeat.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for raising this issue on the floor and stressing the importance of bringing home to those areas where they do not have an understanding of democracy the important principles that we admire so much here and adhere to. What better way to do this, than through a partnership of business and labor working together to stress the important aspects of the free enterprise system. I urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the amendment and to help foster a very important foreign policy initiative that has been started by our President.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I commend him on his statement also. It seems to me all we have to do is look to a country that we are very much interested in now, El Salvador, to see what the Free Labor Institute can do and has been doing, against tremendous odds, by the way.

Several of their people were murdered in cold blood not long ago. That did not discourage them. They stayed with it. I daresay had it not been for the Free Labor Institute and their activities in El Salvador, that country might well have already fallen to the Marxist-Leninists.

(On request of Mr. LAGOMARSINO and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. They were the ones who by organizing the Compesinos were able to persuade the constituent assembly to extend the agrarian reform law.

I think they have done good work there and in lots of other places. I am certainly not saying that because they support me or I support them, otherwise. You can look at my voting record. But I think in this case they are right. They deserve our continued support. They have had it before.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement and associate myself with his remarks. This very debate is an excellent example of democracy at work. There are conservatives and liberals on both sides of this debate. So, I do not think you can really judge this as an issue of ideological division. But just from the standpoint of our democratic institutions, if labor in the United States is as conservative a movement as the chamber of commerce and should not be criticized for being part of this project. Indeed the AFL-CIO is integral to the success of this overall project and I hope my colleagues can put aside whatever differences they may have with labor in general and defeat this amendment. We should be grateful for labor in this country, as it is a bastion of anticommunism and patriotic free enterprise and is uniquely qualified to help expand democracy in a world looking for hope and light of freedom.

(On request of Mr. LIVINGSTON and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KEMP. If the gentleman will yield further, in this country, with these two democratic institutions, labor and business, whatever faults we might find with them on different issues, they are institutions which can be effective in helping spread democratic principles so eloquently testified to by the gentleman in the well. I voted no on the previous amendment and I am going to vote no again and urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and send a signal to the people of the world who yearn for free enterprise and free labor that we mean what we say when we give speeches in support of democracy, human rights, and movements such as Solidarity in Poland and democracy in Central America or wherever.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his stand.

It was my observation when I was in El Salvador to observe those elections a year ago that one of the most effective institutions down there was in fact the AFL-CIO and the labor movement. If we lose the votes of labor in El Salvador, we will lose El Salvador.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman (Mr. BROOMFIELD).

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gen-

tleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA) on his statement and join him in his opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

I think it is important that we continue to support the efforts of labor organizations such as the American Institute for Free Labor Development which has worked so effectively in promoting democracy and combating communism in Latin America, while similar institutes work toward the same objectives in Africa and Asia. The advocates of communism are untiring in their zeal to spread communism throughout the globe. If we want our children to live in freedom, we must be untiring in our efforts to promote democracy and combat the spread of communism. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and support retaining funds to promote democracy.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, my great concern is that we can undo here what can save us countless millions of dollars, can save countless lives and actually we are making democracy work. What the Constitution has; we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. To undo it with a vote, emotionally for or against labor, for or against chambers of commerce, is not the way to make the system work. I would hope you would vote against this amendment and other amendments which sought to undo the great seed that this committee and its members are trying to plant, to bring to other countries that which the good Lord has blessed us with for over 200 years.

□ 1500

Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take near that amount of time. I would just like to point out to the Members that share the sentiments that have been voiced about the strong value for the Free Trade Union Institute. I would certainly echo the comments that have been made that they have done some fine work in the past. I believe that. I share that. I endorse that.

The point is that we have not had this subsidy. We have had help to them before, but they have done that fine work without this program. This is a new program. The work we have talked about has been done without this program.

I think the point is where we spend American dollars. How they are best spent. Is it appropriate to subsidize the chamber of commerce and the unions in their efforts, be they good or bad.

I would urge an "aye" vote on this amendment because I think it speaks

to our financial problem, but more importantly than that, it speaks to the efficacy of subsidizing these groups in this manner.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the time has come to inject some history into this historic debate.

We fought World War I to make the world safe for democracy. Oh what a lovely war. That was pretty expensive. It cost more than \$60 million.

The most recent time I know of when the U.S. taxpayers were forced to put up money for this kind of activity was during the tenure of our late colleague, Joseph R. McCarthy, when a man name G. David Schine and another man named Roy Cohn trapped around Europe using U.S. tax dollars to establish what they in their day called a demiform. It was supposed to be the answer to the commiform.

Now here we go again. A foundation on democracy. All you have to do is go to El Salvador, a couple of junketeers, step out on the battlefields, the soldiers on both sides will lay down their guns and listen to a few American speeches. And we can insert democracy into El Salvador.

Well, I suppose you could sum up this legislation very simply: What this country needs is a good \$60 million junket.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take 1 minute to say that last session of Congress I served on the committee with the gentleman from Florida and I can say that we are going to spend some \$250 billion in defense this year, but the most powerful weapon in our arsenal, if we really believe it, is the idea of freedom.

Now we have \$30 million and people get up and say we are going to do something with our deficits, we are going to do something with our budget because we are going to save \$30 million.

This is the most powerful weapon we have, an idea. An idea is devine. And if we are not willing to stand behind what we believe in, the principles of democracy, then I think we can close up shop here.

I certainly hope that we stand behind the gentleman from Florida and all of the other people who have worked so hard on this legislation, because it is the best investment we can make for America, not only today, but also tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. SIMON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2915) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1984 and 1985 for the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Board for International Broadcasting, the Inter-American Foundation, and the Asia Foundation, to establish the National Endowment for Democracy, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 198, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2915, DEPARTMENT OF STATE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1984 AND 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2915, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1590, EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION ACT OF 1983

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resoluton 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 207

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1590) to provide emergency food assistance to low-income and unemployed persons and to improve the commodity distribution pro-

gram, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. It shall be in order to consider the amendment to said substitute printed on page E2450 of the Congressional Record of May 23, 1983 by Representative de la Garza of Texas, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1510

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES of North Carolina). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TAYLOR), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 207 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1590, the Emergency Food Assistance and Commodity Distribution Act of 1983. The resolution allows 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. This is an open rule, allowing any germane amendment to be offered under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the bill's consideration a motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

The rule makes the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute in order for amendment purposes, and provides that the substitute be read by titles, rather than by sections,

in order to facilitate the amendment process. The resolution waives points or order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 303(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and also waives points of order against consideration of the committee amendment for failure to comply with clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Budget Act.

Section 303(a)(1) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of any measure providing new budget authority for a fiscal year before the adoption of the first budget resolution for that fiscal year. The budget authority contained in H.R. 1590 and the committee amendment fall within the spending limits of House Concurrent Resolution 91 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 the House- and Senate-passed budget resolutions. However, the budget authority in both the bill and the substitute are in technical violation of section 303(a)(1) since the conference report on the first concurrent budget resolution has not been adopted.

In addition, certain provisions in the committee amendment require the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the costs of initial processing and packaging of commodities and to reimburse State agencies for certain costs they might incur in handling food commodities. This constitutes an appropriation in an authorization bill and therefore requires a waiver of clause 5, rule XXI.

Finally, the rule also makes in order an amendment to the committee substitute to be offered by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and waives points of order pursuant to clause 5, rule XXI and section 303(a)(1) of the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1590 is designed to establish a system of commodity distribution to address the critical nutritional needs of individuals all over the country affected by high unemployment and persistence of poverty. Through a network of State and local government agencies as well as private hunger relief centers, H.R. 1590 would attempt to meet a serious nutritional need through the distribution of excess Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. This measure will not permanently authorize an addition to other Federal food aid programs. Rather, H.R. 1590 is intended to respond to the emergency created by the current economic crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to allow its consideration by adopting House Resolution 207.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 207 is an open rule under which the House will consider legislation to provide emergency food assistance to low-income and unemployed persons and

to improve the commodity distribution program.

The rule waives the point of order that would otherwise lie against consideration of the bill, H.R. 1590, for failure to comply with the Budget Act. The waiver in this instance is of section 303(a)(1) of the Budget Act, which requires adoption of the first budget resolution prior to enactment of new budget authority. This bill provides new budget authority, and the Congress has not yet adopted a budget resolution, so this waiver is necessary for floor consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order a committee amendment by the Committee on Agriculture, now printed in the bill, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule. The committee amendment will be read for amendment by sections, with each section considered as read.

A waiver of section 303(a)(1) is also provided for the committee amendment, again because the Congress has not yet adopted our first budget resolution and the committee amendment provides new budget authority. In addition, the rule waives clause 5, of rule XXI against the committee substitute. This waiver is provided because some provisions of the committee amendment may constitute appropriations in a legislative bill.

The rule makes in order an amendment to be offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA). His amendment was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, and it will be offered to the substitute reported from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides the necessary waivers of the Budget Act and of clause 5, of rule XXI, for the gentleman's amendment. Here again, the amendment provides new budget authority prior to adoption of our first budget resolution and it contains language which may be appropriations in a legislative bill.

Lastly, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this rule requires the Department of Agriculture to make available commodities, acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under our price support programs, to public and private nonprofit organizations which provide food to low-income and unemployed needy persons.

Under the provisions of the bill, and the committee substitute written primarily by the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. EMERSON), the surplus commodities for this emergency food assistance program must be in excess of the quantities necessary to

carry out the payment-in-kind land diversion program.

Mr. Speaker, the substitute provides that these excess commodities would be made available to the recipient agencies at no charge, and the Commodity Credit Corporation will partially reimburse the State for their administrative costs. The bill further stipulates that the recipients of commodities shall not be required to pay for the food they receive.

The rule reported from the Committee on Rules provides an orderly way for the House to consider this important legislation, which is presently scheduled for next week.

There was no controversy about this rule during our hearing in the Committee on Rules, and I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1590. As one of the original cosponsors of this bill I urge Members to vote for this bill. This bill provides that surplus commodities—those in excess of our domestic and foreign commitments—will be used to feed needy Americans. When the need for food and surplus commodities both exist it makes commonsense to take these commodities and make them available to people in need. That is what H.R. 1590 does.

Surplus commodities do exist. Testimony was received by the subcommittee from the General Accounting Office. Representatives from GAO stated that the Department of Agriculture's stocks of commodities are at an all-time high. At the end of 1982 surpluses held by the Department included such commodities as dairy products, rice, honey, sugar, and vegetable oil. Not all of these commodities will remain at high levels or in surplus; however, it is expected that many commodities will be in surplus and will be available for distribution to needy people.

Not only will better use be made of the commodities by distributing them to the needy—the Federal Government will save money that is now being spent on storage of the commodities. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that over \$5 million in storage costs can be saved by distributing commodities such as wheat, honey, rice, and nonfat dry milk. Additionally the Federal Government saves approximately \$26 million per year in storage costs because of the current surplus dairy distribution program.

H.R. 1590 will provide approximately \$1 billion in commodities, in addition to the surplus dairy distribution. These commodities will be distributed by soup kitchens, food banks, and similar charitable organizations. Additionally these commodities will be used in school lunch programs and elderly nutrition programs. Administra-

time money is provided, up to a maximum of \$50 million, to assist States in transporting, handling, and storing surplus commodities.

Ours is a nation of plenty and while there are positive signs that the economy is turning around—there are families and individuals who need food assistance. I believe H.R. 1590 effectively deals with these two issues—the need to feed poor people and the food surpluses in agriculture. This is a timely and important bill and one that will contribute toward resolution of these issues.

I urge Members to support H.R. 1590.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 346, nays 51, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—346

Ackerman	Carney	Dyson
Akaka	Carper	Eckart
Albosta	Carr	Edwards (AL)
Alexander	Chandler	Edwards (CA)
Anderson	Chappell	Emerson
Andrews (NC)	Clarke	English
Andrews (TX)	Clay	Erdreich
Annunzio	Clinger	Erlenborn
Anthony	Coats	Evans (IA)
Applegate	Coelho	Evans (IL)
Aspin	Coleman (MO)	Fascell
AuCoin	Coleman (TX)	Feighan
Barnard	Collins	Ferraro
Barnes	Conable	Fiedler
Bartlett	Conte	Flippo
Bates	Cooper	Florio
Bedell	Corcoran	Foglietta
Bennett	Coughlin	Foley
Bereuter	Courter	Ford (TN)
Berman	Coyne	Forsythe
Bevill	Crockett	Fowler
Blaggi	D'Amours	Frank
Bliley	Daschle	Frost
Boehlert	Daub	Fuqua
Boggs	Davis	Garcia
Boner	de la Garza	Gaydos
Bonior	Dellums	Gejdenson
Bonker	Derrick	Gekas
Borski	Dickinson	Gephardt
Bosco	Dicks	Gibbons
Boucher	Dingell	Gillman
Boxer	Dixon	Gingrich
Breaux	Donnelly	Glickman
Britt	Dorgan	Gonzalez
Brooks	Dowdy	Gore
Brown (CA)	Downey	Gradison
Broyhill	Duncan	Gray
Bryant	Durbin	Green
Byron	Dwyer	Guarini
Campbell	Dymally	Gunderson

Hall (IN)	McDade
Hall (OH)	McEwen
Hall, Ralph	McHugh
Hall, Sam	McKinney
Hamilton	McNulty
Hammerschmidt	Mica
Hance	Michel
Hansen (UT)	Mikulski
Harkin	Miller (CA)
Harrison	Miller (OH)
Hatcher	Mineta
Hawkins	Minish
Hefner	Mitchell
Hertel	Moakley
Hightower	Mollinari
Hillis	Mollohan
Hopkins	Montgomery
Horton	Moody
Howard	Moore
Hoyer	Morrison (CT)
Huckaby	Morrison (WA)
Hughes	Mrazek
Hunter	Murphy
Hutto	Murtha
Ireland	Myers
Jacobs	Natcher
Jenkins	Neal
Johnson	Nelson
Jones (NC)	Nichols
Jones (OK)	O'Brien
Jones (TN)	Oakar
Kaptur	Oberstar
Kasich	Obey
Kastenmeier	Olin
Kazen	Ortiz
Kemp	Owens
Kennelly	Oxley
Kildee	Packard
Kindness	Panetta
Kogovsek	Parris
Kostmayer	Pashayan
Kramer	Patman
Lagomarsino	Patterson
Latta	Pease
Leach	Penny
Leath	Pepper
Lehman (CA)	Perkins
Lehman (FL)	Pickle
Leland	Price
Lent	Pritchard
Levin	Quillen
Levine	Rahall
Levitass	Rangel
Lewis (CA)	Ratchford
Lewis (FL)	Ray
Lipinski	Reid
Livingston	Richardson
Loeffler	Ridge
Long (LA)	Rinaldo
Long (MD)	Ritter
Lott	Robinson
Lowery (CA)	Rodino
Lowry (WA)	Roe
Lujan	Rogers
Lujan	Rose
Lukens	Wolpe
Lundine	Rostenkowski
Madigan	Roth
Markey	Roukema
Marlenee	Rowland
Marriott	Roybal
Martini (NC)	Rudd
Martin (NY)	Russo
Matsui	Sabo
Mazzoli	Savage
McCloskey	Sawyer
McCurdy	Schaefer

NAYS—51

Archer	Goodling	Ottinger
Bateman	Gramm	Petri
Bethune	Gregg	Porter
Bilirakis	Hansen (ID)	Roberts
Broomfield	Hiler	Rosen
Brown (CO)	Holt	Sensenbrenner
Burton	LaFalce	Shaw
Chapple	Lungren	Shelby
Craig	Mack	Shumway
Crane, Daniel	Martin (IL)	Siljander
Daniel	McCandless	Smith, Denny
Dannemeyer	McCollum	Stump
DeWine	McDonald	Thomas (CA)
Dreier	McGrath	Vucanovich
Edgar	McKernan	Walker
Edwards (OK)	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Fields	Nielson	Zschau

Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Shannon
Sharp
Shuster
Sikorski
Simon
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Stagers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vandergriff
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams (MT)
Winn
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—35

Addabbo	Frenzel	McCain
Badham	Hartnett	Nowak
Bellenson	Heftel	Paul
Boland	Hubbard	Pursell
Cheney	Hyde	Regula
Conyers	Jeffords	Schneider
Crane, Phillip	Kolter	Sisisky
Early	Lantos	Studds
Fazio	Lloyd	Weber
Fish	MacKay	Williams (OH)
Ford (MI)	Martinez	Wilson
Franklin	Mavroules	

□ 1530

The resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCLERODERMA WEEK

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 75) to provide for the designation of June 12 through 18, 1983, as "National Scleroderma Week," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I take this time only to say that the minority has looked at the legislation, and we have no objection to it.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, a similar resolution was adopted last year. I want to thank the subcommittee and the committee for their work in expediting this resolution and bringing it to the floor, because this does begin on June 12 and goes through June 18, and the groups that are concerned about scleroderma and the impact of this disease on many people in this country appreciate our expeditious treatment of this resolution. A similar resolution has passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the leadership of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for bringing this important resolution to the House floor today. House Joint Resolution 225, and its Senate equivalent, Senate Joint Resolution 75, authorizes the President to designate the week of June 12 through June 18 of this year as National Scleroderma Week. It is similar to a resolution adopted last year, and I think its importance is illustrated by the large number of cosponsors it has gained in the House

and the Senate both last year and this. Since the Senate has already approved the resolution, it is my hope that the President will issue this proclamation within the next few days.

Scleroderma, for those of my colleagues who are not familiar with this disease, is a painful and debilitating ailment that attacks the skin and multiple organs of the body. In its most serious form, scleroderma can strike the esophagus, intestines, lungs, heart, or kidneys, causing fibrosis, inflammation, and atrophy of normal functioning tissues. Two major problems caused by scleroderma are decreased circulation and increased production of collagen. Localized scleroderma causes hardening and thickening of the skin, particularly of the hands and fingers, along with painful ulcerations.

This disease, one of the many forms of arthritis, affects an estimated 300,000 people in the United States. However, the actual number of victims may be higher because of misdiagnosed cases. Four times as many women as men develop scleroderma in early and middle age.

Unfortunately, the cause of scleroderma is unknown, and there is no permanent cure for the disease. While there is no specific treatment for scleroderma, various medications and therapies can alleviate symptoms. But research is being conducted at medical centers throughout the United States in search of a cure.

Lack of focus on this disease has resulted in a shortage of funding for this vital research. At a time when public funding for many worthy causes is scarce, we need to encourage private funding, and National Scleroderma Week will bring the additional attention to this disease that will boost public consciousness about scleroderma, as well as lend comfort to its hundreds of thousands of victims.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their support of this resolution.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES. 75

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President shall issue a proclamation designating June 12 through June 18, 1983, as "National Scleroderma Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana, Mrs. HALL, is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, scleroderma is a painful and debilitating disease which attacks the skin and

multiple organs of the body. It affects at least 300,000 people in the United States, but the actual number of victims may be higher because of misdiagnosed cases. Four times as many women as men develop scleroderma in early and middle age. The cause is unknown and there is no cure.

Designation of this week will focus attention on this disease and encourage funding for research.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 201) designating June 14, 1983, as "Baltic Freedom Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 201 designating June 14, 1983, as "Baltic Freedom Day."

Mr. Speaker, on June 14, 1940, 43 years ago, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied and incorporated the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R.

Before the conquest of these three nations, they had a short yet glorious period of independence. Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia all declared their independence following World War I and enjoyed a democratic government. Under Stalin, tens of thousands of the Baltic peoples were killed and over a million were deported to slave labor camps. Many others were removed from their homelands because of the resistance to the subjugation or because of their political and religious views. The Baltic people were replaced by people from the Soviet empire. This exchange of population has substantially altered the ethnic composition of the Baltic nations.

Throughout the free world, the peoples of Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian origin have maintained their traditional civic, cultural, and church organizations and bravely continue their efforts on behalf of their repressed compatriots held captive within the U.S.S.R.

The plight of the Baltic people is equal in gravity to that of the Poles and Afghans but they have not re-

ceived the intense media attention that these more recent examples of Soviet expansion and tyranny have for the simple reason that their battle for freedom is an old one. Despite their 43-year fight for autonomy, these States remain under Soviet domination. Yet this has neither dampened their spirit of determination, nor lessened their strong sense of culture and tradition that unifies them.

As we draw attention to this tragic anniversary, we must recognize that it is the responsibility of the United States to support the cause of freedom for these Baltic people. Only with the end of political repression, religious persecution, and cultural genocide in these three nations can the legitimate aspirations of the Baltic people be fulfilled.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution designating June 14, 1983, as "Baltic Freedom Day" and applaud the unyielding courage of the Baltics in the continuous pursuit of freedom.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. Under my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 201 declaring June 14, 1983, as Baltic Freedom Day. I would also like to commend my colleagues BRIAN DONNELLY and HENRY HYDE for their work in getting this resolution before Congress.

Forty-three years have passed since the Soviets occupied Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Their continuing occupation is illegal and their attempts to destroy the culture, religion, language, and traditions of the Baltic peoples is reprehensible. Passage of this resolution will be a message from freedom-loving Americans that we have not forgotten these terrible acts and that we will not lessen our vigil until these brave people are free again.

In June of 1941, Soviet forces occupied the neutral and sovereign countries of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. While their occupation lasted only a week, the Soviets succeeded in deporting virtually everyone who had connections with the military, government, or who were members of the educated elite. On the night of June 14, some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were forcibly deported to Siberia; 5,000 more were summarily executed.

The Soviet occupation combined with the 3½-year Nazi occupation resulted in the displacement or death of 850,000 Baltic peoples and reduced the combined population by almost 10 percent. The end of World War II did not end the nightmare of the Baltic peoples. Instead of freedom, they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet

Union and have been under Soviet domination ever since.

Despite tremendous odds, they have continued to keep their culture and traditions alive for future generations. They are a gallant people. I am proud to say that my district, the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania, has benefited greatly from the many people of Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian heritage who came to our community to escape Soviet oppression and injustice. Individually and as a group their many contributions have contributed to the betterment of our community and I salute them.

I urge Congress' passage of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. Continuing my reservation to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 201, the Baltic Freedom Day resolution, which recognizes the continuing desire and right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R.

There is an exciting parallel between this resolution and developments yesterday and today in Moscow and Washington. I am gravely concerned over this ominous series of events.

The resolution before us deplors the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to recognize the sovereignty of the Baltic Republics. And it deplors the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to yield to the Republics' rightful demands for independence from foreign domination and oppression.

This resolution commemorates the 14th day of June as the anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples from their homelands in 1941. It was in the year before that—1940—that the U.S.S.R. illegally occupied the Baltic Republics. And since that time, the U.S.S.R. has systematically removed the Baltic people from their homelands by deporting them to Siberia, causing masses of other people to relocate in the Republics.

Today is an infamous day in Baltic States history.

Yesterday, the New York Times reported that a 6-week-old Soviet anti-Zionist Committee had been formed which contends that Soviet Jewry immigration has virtually ceased, purportedly because those who wanted to leave have already left.

Mr. Speaker, there is a correlation between that committee's allegations in Moscow and the work of our House Post Office Subcommittee on Investigations, in which we have been looking into the matter of Soviet interference with U.S. mail to Iron Curtain countries. We have found that there has been substantial interference, which we believe is an attempt to cut off the

lifeline of those Soviet citizens wishing to emigrate to the United States and elsewhere.

In our recent investigation of Soviet interference, we have accumulated over 200 documents thus far. One-third of those documents pertain to the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

We have also documented evidence that packages are being confiscated, that postage surcharges are being imposed in an effort at harassment and we have recent reports that the Soviets have lists of citizens who are prohibited from receiving letters from the United States, and lists of persons who are not allowed to mail out.

Our Postal Investigations Subcommittee will be conducting hearings later on this year on this issue in San Francisco and in Washington to consider the evidence and witnesses from many American ethnic groups on their experiences in trying to get mail into the Baltic Republics.

With regard, to the puppet anti-Zionist committee set up in Moscow, I should like to repeat here on the floor what I said at a press conference earlier today on behalf of the Human Rights Caucus:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

The allegations coming from a six-week-old anti-Zionist Committee in Moscow are ridiculous.

To claim that Jewish immigration has virtually ceased—all because those who wanted to leave have already left—is absurd.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee—the latter of which has been investigating Soviet interference with U.S. mail directed to Soviet citizens—I have arrived at several conclusions:

First, there is an unprecedented escalation in Soviet interference with the mail. The reason for this is that to make application to emigrate, Soviet Jews must include a handwritten invitation from a sponsor in America.

If they don't have the invitation, they can't make application. If they don't get their mail, they can't receive an invitation. The catch 22 is as simple as that.

The Subcommittee on Investigations has documented nearly 200 cases of mail interference. And we will hold hearings on the issue next month in San Francisco.

My second observation is that the very creation of the anti-Zionist Committee makes me suspect of its motives, its membership and its goals.

The Committee's allegations of secret cooperation between Zionism and Nazism should be rejected out of hand.

Clearly, the overall Soviet game plan is to (1) cut off the "lifeline" for its citizens who wish to emigrate; and (2) pump disinformation into those who stay behind, as well as to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, on this occasion in which we underscore the oppression of Soviet Citizens in the Baltic States, it is incredible that we are once again confronted with new evidence of Soviet interference in human rights. It is clearly more than just another

"crackdown". It appears to be something more extensive.

Our House Subcommittee on Postal Investigations would welcome any evidence of mail tampering which other members of the Congress might be able to gain through their on-going communication with ethnic, scientific, religious and human rights groups.

□ 1540

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COURTER. Under my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of House Joint Resolution 201, the Baltic Freedom Day resolution, along with Congressman RITTER, Congressman HYDE, and 230 House Members, I am very pleased that the House is taking action on this worthy legislation today and I thank the committee for its attention to this matter.

It is of great importance to the brave people behind the Iron Curtain that we pass this resolution, and commemorate June 14 as Baltic Freedom Day. Enactment of this legislation for the second consecutive year demonstrates that our Government and the people it represents care deeply about the cause of freedom in the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia that we stand in solidarity with the people of the illegally occupied Baltic States, and call once again upon the Soviet Union to remove its forces from the nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

House Joint Resolution 201 states that, "the Congress recognizes the continuing desire and the right of the people of the Baltic States for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R." It was on June 14 in 1940 that the Soviet Army brutalized and deported thousands of Baltic families to the barren wastes of Siberia. Let us not forget the infamy and inhumanity that the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia were subjected to on that dark day. But in remembering the legacy of the Soviet occupation of the Baltic States, let us also remember, that to this day, the struggle for freedom and independence continues undaunted, and remains very much alive, in the Baltic States.

We in Congress will continue to do all we can to keep the plight of the people of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia an active concern in the community of nations and particularly in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding under his reservation, and I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for bringing this resolution to the House.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 201

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have cherished the principles of religious and political freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Baltic Republics have existed as independent, sovereign nations belonging to and fully recognized by the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of the Baltic Republics have individual and separate cultures, national traditions, and languages distinctively foreign to those of Russia; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) in 1940 did illegally seize and occupy the Baltic Republics and by force incorporate them against their national will and contrary to their desire for independence and sovereignty into the U.S.S.R.; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. since 1940 has systematically removed native Baltic peoples from their homelands by deporting them to Siberia and caused great masses of Russians to relocate in the Republics, thus threatening the Baltic cultures with extinction; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has imposed upon the captive people of the Baltic Republics an oppressive political system which has destroyed every vestige of democracy, civil liberties, and religious freedom; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia find themselves today subjugated by the U.S.S.R., locked into a union they deplore, denied basic human rights, and persecuted for daring to protest; and

Whereas the United States stands as a champion of liberty, dedicated to the principles of national self-determination, human rights, and religious freedom, and opposed to oppression and imperialism; and

Whereas the United States, as a member of the United Nations, has repeatedly voted with a majority of that international body to uphold the right of other countries of the world, including those in Africa and Asia, to determine their fates and be free of foreign domination; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. has steadfastly refused to return to the people of the Baltic States the right to exist as independent republics separate and apart from the U.S.S.R. or permit a return of personal, political, and religious freedoms: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States recognizes the continuing desire and the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R. and deplores the refusal of the U.S.S.R. to recognize the sovereignty of the Baltic Republics and to yield to their rightful demands for independence from foreign domination and oppression and that the fourteenth day of June 1983, the anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples from their homelands in 1941, be designated "Baltic Freedom Day" as a symbol of the solidarity of the American people with the aspirations of the enslaved Baltic people and that the President of the United States be authorized and requested to issue a proclamation for the observance of Baltic Free-

dom Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have cherished the principles of religious and political freedom and independence. The Baltic Republics have existed as independent, sovereign nations belonging to and fully recognized by the League of Nations. For these and other reasons, the Congress of the United States should recognize the continuing desire and the right of the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for freedom and independence from the domination of the U.S.S.R.

● Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 201, a resolution designating June 14, 1983, as "Baltic Freedom Day." This joint resolution serves to remind us of the unfortunate plight of the peoples of the Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who have been subjugated by the Soviet Union since 1940. For over 40 years they have been denied civil liberties, freedom of religious expression, and the right to self-determination.

June 14 marks the 22d anniversary of the mass deportation of Baltic peoples from their homelands, by designating June 14 as Baltic Freedom Day, the Members of the House of Representatives champion the rights of the Baltic people to enjoy rights conferred under international law.

I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable BRIAN DONNELLY, for introducing this resolution which I am glad to cosponsor. I urge its immediate adoption. ●

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 3151

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 3151, the Jack Watson Post Office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I would just like to make an inquiry as to whether the minority has been notified.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. COURTER. They have no objection?

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. They have no objection.

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PARALYZED VETERANS RECOGNITION DAY

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 258) designating August 3, 1983, as "National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. COURTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to say that the minority has looked at this and we have absolutely no objection whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 258

Whereas among those Americans who have answered their country's call to service in defense of its freedoms, there are thousands who, as a result of service in our Nation's military forces, have suffered the catastrophic disability of paralysis;

Whereas despite the extreme severity of this disability, these veterans have succeeded in leading useful and productive lives, in part through Federal programs for their readjustment but, more significantly, by drawing upon a special brand of heroism;

Whereas our country now enjoys the blessing of peace, and it is appropriate that all Americans recognize the special debt owed to those who have been paralyzed in the defense of our freedoms during the wars of this country; and

Whereas the sacrifices and contributions that these veterans have made and the service rendered by the many veterans who later suffered paralysis from nonservice related causes are deserving of national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That August 3, 1983, is designated as "National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to set aside this day to honor the sacrifices and services of paralyzed veterans in an appropriate manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HALL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, thousands who have served in the defense of this country's freedom suffered the catastrophic disability of paralysis. In part through Federal programs but largely by drawing on a special brand of heroism, these veterans have succeeded in leading useful and productive lives. All Americans owe a special debt to those who have been paralyzed while serving during the wars of this century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution which authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation to honor these veterans on August 3.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this time to thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for her support as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 258 and for her assistance as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population in promptly presenting the resolution to the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker. I rise today to urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this resolution which gives special recognition and thanks to the thousands of men and women who unselfishly defended this Nation in times of turmoil and who suffered severe injuries resulting in the catastrophic disability of paralysis. These veterans are most deserving of this special tribute, not only for their sacrifice to our country, but also for the debilitating physical impairment with which they must live. Equally important, however, we should recognize and commend the remarkable adjustment these individuals have made. Their strength and determination have enabled them to successfully overcome their handicaps and to lead meaningful and productive lives. These valuable members of our society should be an example to all of us for their courage and unselfishness.

I thank the 249 Members who have cosponsored this measure and have indicated their support for House Joint Resolution 258 and for the paralyzed veterans of America. I believe that designation of August 3 of this year as National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day in conjunction with the issuance of the special commemorative stamp by the U.S. Postal Service would be a most fitting tribute to those who have sacrificed so much for our country. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of this resolution and our paralyzed veterans and I am confident that this measure will be supported enthusiastically by the Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, comments of major veter-

ans service organizations on this resolution:

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1983.

Hon. JOE MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rules of the
House, House Committee on Rules, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOAKLEY: On behalf of the members of Paralyzed Veterans of America, I greatly appreciate your introduction of House Joint Resolution 258 which would designate August 3, 1983, as "National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day."

PVA, a Congressionally chartered veterans' service organization, has a 37 year history of representing the needs of veterans who have incurred spinal cord injury or dysfunction. PVA has worked with many other national organizations to promote the interests of all veterans who have suffered paralysis. Our twofold goal is to ensure that the best possible medical care and rehabilitation is available while all possible efforts are made to develop cures and treatments for these costly and catastrophic medical conditions.

PVA strongly believes that the passage of House Joint Resolution 258 is especially important to raise the public awareness of the sacrifices and needs of America's veterans who are paralyzed. Equally important is that this Resolution illuminates the capabilities and successes of paralyzed veterans rather than their disabilities.

Again PVA thanks you for your efforts on behalf of the nation's paralyzed veterans and for your introduction of House Joint Resolution 258 designating August 3, 1983, as "National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day." If successfully enacted, this measure should go far in demonstrating the nation's concern and appreciation to paralyzed veterans who have served and sacrificed for their country.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL M. CHEREMETA,
National President.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1983.

Hon. JOE MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Rules of the
House, Committee on Rules, U.S. House
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have noted your introduction of H.J. Res. 258 to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating August 3, 1983 as National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day.

On behalf of the more than 2.5 million men and women of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and our Ladies Auxiliary, I wholeheartedly support the passage of this resolution to recognize the great sacrifice made by our nation's paralyzed veterans in service to our country.

With best wishes and kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

JAMES R. CURRIEO,
National Commander-in-Chief.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1983.

Hon. JOHN J. MOAKLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOAKLEY: The Disabled American Veterans is pleased to lend its strong support to House Joint Resolution 258—a bill which would set aside August 3,

1983 as National Paralyzed Veterans Recognition Day honoring the thousands of American veterans who have suffered devastating injuries resulting in paralysis.

America owes no greater debt of gratitude to those who have served in the Armed Forces than to its veterans who became paralyzed during the course of their military service to the nation. Passage of your bill would, of course, pay tribute to the sacrifices made by paralyzed veterans but, as importantly, would also recognize their success in overcoming their severe impairments and their determination to live productive lives.

On behalf of the more than three-quarters of a million members of the DAV, particularly those within our ranks who are paralyzed veterans, I wish to thank you for your strong efforts to give national recognition to America's paralyzed veterans. You have our wholehearted support!

Cordially yours,

EDWARD G. GALLIAN,
National Commander.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to my colleague and cosponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in strong support of this Paralyzed Veterans' Recognition Day on August 3, 1983.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for his strong leadership in getting this bill before the House, and also the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HALL), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, it has been a pleasure for me to work closely with paralyzed veterans throughout the country. Thousands of paralyzed veterans belong to the Paralyzed Veterans of America, ably led by its national president, Mr. Paul Cheremeta, Mr. Jack Powell, executive director, and Mr. Doug Vollmer, legislative director. This organization has provided strong leadership and input into legislation we have enacted over the years. PVA is a very active organization which fosters the highest ideal of the disabled in the work force, and through its generous funding of spinal cord injury research, the organization has enhanced the lives of veterans and all disabled people.

Mr. Speaker, in working with this fine organization, and the other outstanding veterans organizations who are vitally interested in helping the catastrophically disabled veteran, I have come to appreciate and value the contributions of our Nation's handicapped people more than ever before. They should be recognized for their great work.

I am, therefore, pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and others in support of the resolution that would set aside August 3 as a special day in honor of our Nation's paralyzed veterans.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DONNELLY), a cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me echo the words of my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, in congratulating my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for his leadership in bringing this very important resolution before the House; also the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and its Subcommittee on Census and Population.

This is a very important resolution. I think that it is important for the Congress of the United States to recognize the contributions that paralyzed veterans have made to this society and also show that there is a commitment in this institution that the programs that are available to these individuals will be continued, they will be strengthened and that there is hope in the future and that this Congress will not forget what they have given fighting for freedom and the type of leadership and courage that they show in their day-to-day lives.

I again congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for her support and her leadership in this effort.

● Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a cosponsor of legislation to pay tribute to the paralyzed veterans of this Nation whose service and sacrifice on behalf of our great land must never be forgotten.

While exact figures are hard to come by, it is estimated that there are as many as 30,000 paralyzed veterans in the country. These men and women must constantly face the difficulties and challenges of their paralysis and the many medical and emotional hardships that accompany a devastating injury. It is fitting that the sacrifices, the needs, and the deep courage of these veterans be publically recognized.

Equally important, however, is the need to recognize the tremendous capabilities and successes of paralyzed veterans. We can all be humbled and encouraged by the determination of these special veterans to be active and productive citizens and their refusal to give up the fight in the face of great adversity.

Paralyzed veterans have continued to serve the Nation in the various veterans organizations, providing help and service not only to those veterans who suffer paralysis, but to all veterans, and to all Americans. The Para-

lyzed Veterans of America is one such organization and its 11,000 members can be proud of their work on behalf of veterans through their programs in the area of service, sports, advocacy, research, and legislation. This congressionally chartered group has 34 chapters and 50 service offices nationwide which provide assistance to all veterans and which serve as resource and support centers for paralyzed veterans.

We owe these men and women not only our gratitude, but our admiration as well, and this resolution is a small but significant means of honoring the paralyzed veterans of this country. I am proud to give it my strong support. ●

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA STATEHOOD DAY

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) designating Alaska Statehood Day, January 3, 1984, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. COURTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I would just like to mention the fact that this, once again, as well as the prior three resolutions which came before, is a good resolution. I support it. The minority is involved with it. We have no objection.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Alaska for sponsoring it and note that today here is Washington, D.C. is "Don Young Day," because he is now today 50 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, at this time it gives me great pleasure to yield to the great gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Don Young).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind remarks.

This is a day of celebration on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago this month, Congress approved the Alaska Statehood Act, paving the way for Alaska's entry into the Union as the 49th State. On July 7, 1958, President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the statehood bill, providing the final action needed to complete the act. Alaska formally entered the Union 6 months later, January 3, 1959. This legislation, House Joint Resolution 161, commemorates 25 years of Alaska

statehood and designates January 3, 1984, the silver anniversary of Alaska's formal entry into the Union, as Alaska Statehood Day.

Statehood for Alaska did not come easily. Most citizens of the lower 48 knew very little about the territory, a situation which persists today. Alaska was unknown and misunderstood. Charges were made that Alaska could not support itself. Alaskans, however, knew the vast potential of their land, and fought hard for statehood recognition. They reacted with unrestrained joy to the news of the signing of the Statehood Act. Bold, half-page headlines declared, "we're in," residents danced in the streets, and church bells and factory whistles spread the news.

Alaska has made impressive progress in the first 25 years of statehood. For an initial investment of just over \$7 million, the United States has reaped a bonanza in return. Alaska produces one-eighth of the Nation's gold; one-fifth of the Nation's oil; and two-fifths of its harvested fish. Seventy-four percent of the Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, containing vast amounts of resources lies off Alaska's coast. The State has developed a fine system of State universities, and communication and transportation facilities. Alaskans are a proud people, proud of their land and their resources, and proud to be Americans. Our strengths come from our people and our resources, and our ability to make the best use of each. Alaskans are noted for their determination, their originality, and their fierce dedication to the principles of freedom. Alaskans believe in America and in the principles of American democracy. Alaskans participate in their government; fully 75 percent of the registered voters in Alaska participated in the last general election. We are a growing State, with a vision for the future. Alaska looks forward to the next 25 years of statehood, and to continued progress.

I am certain that my colleagues join me in recognition of 25 years of Alaska statehood, and I ask their support in approving this measure.

□ 1550

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Whereas July 7, 1983, marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of enactment of the Alaska Statehood Act as approved by the United States Congress and signed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower;

Whereas the Alaska Statehood Act authorizes the entry of Alaska into the Union on January 3, 1959;

Whereas the State of Alaska is still growing and developing based on the principles established by the Alaska Statehood Act;

Whereas the Alaska Statehood Act is the foundation of the union between the State of Alaska and the United States of America which has been to the benefit of both parties;

Whereas many commitments between Alaska and the Federal Government are still being fulfilled;

Whereas the State of Alaska is a storehouse of this Nation's natural resources;

Whereas Alaska provides one-eighth of the Nation's gold; one-fifth of the Nation's oil production; and two-fifths of its harvested fish all to the benefit to the Union;

Whereas Alaska possesses ten of the sixteen strategic minerals needed for our Nation's security;

Whereas the Federal Government collects \$3 in taxes from Alaska for every \$1 it spends there;

Whereas the United States has reaped economic rewards from Alaska many times greater than its original \$7,000,000 investment;

Whereas the people of Alaska contribute to the cultural diversity and cultural resources of this Nation; and

Whereas the Alaska Statehood Act authorized Alaska's entry into the United States of America and provided the basis for these benefits shared by Alaska and the Union; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That January 3, 1984, be known as "Alaska Statehood Day" in honor of the silver anniversary of the entry of Alaska into the Union. The President is requested and authorized to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States; and the Federal, State, and local governments to observe "Alaska Statehood Day" with the appropriate ceremonies and recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, July 7, 1983, marks the 25th anniversary of the enactment of the Alaska Statehood Act as approved by the U.S. Congress and signed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. The Alaska Statehood Act authorized the entry of Alaska into the Union on January 3, 1959. This resolution would designate January 3, 1984, as Alaska Statehood Day in honor of the silver anniversary of the entry of Alaska into the Union.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HALL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the various resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE REAL SPACE WAR

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, according to the U.S. Department of Defense, the Soviet Union has an operational capability to destroy satellites in near-Earth orbit by using a type of anti-satellite (ASAT) called a killer satellite. The United States had an operational ASAT system using ground-based missiles, but it was deactivated in 1975; a new ASAT device using miniature homing vehicles launched from F-15 aircraft is now being developed. The Soviets continue to test their ASAT system and President Reagan has reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to developing an operational ASAT system.

During 1978 and 1979, the United States and Soviet Union held ASAT limitation talks, but no further talks have been scheduled. In the fall of 1981, the Soviets introduced a draft treaty at the United Nations to ban weapons from space, although it apparently would not include the ground or airbased systems now in use or development.

The question is: Should the United States develop an operational ASAT capability, or should the focus instead be on renewing the stalled ASAT limitation talks, or should there be some combination of the two approaches?

In the absence of an ASAT limitation treaty, should the United States place more emphasis on means to insure survivability of critical military satellites and their associated ground stations and data links?

Is space the proper high ground for war? What will be the effect of placing antisatellite weapons in space, both from the perspective of geopolitical stability and national defense?

To help you answer these and other questions, the Congressional Space Caucus will host a debate on ASAT's on Monday, June 13 at 3 p.m. in 2168 Rayburn. Dr. Richard Garwin, physicist and defense consultant, will present the case against ASAT's. Dr. Colin S. Gray, president of the National Institute for Public Policy, will present the case for development of this new weapon. Since this issue will be hotly debated soon during the course of floor debate on the DOD authorization bill, I urge you not to miss this debate.

Prior to the debate at 3 p.m., there will be a briefing on ASAT's by the Office of Technology Assessment, the Congressional Research Service and the GAO. The briefing will cover United States and Soviet space systems, and will also include a discussion of what an ASAT system would cost. The ASAT briefing will be held in 2257 RHOB at 11 a.m. There can be no

doubt that this issue is of critical importance to the future of our space-faring nation. I urge you and your staff to attend both the briefing and debate on Monday, June 13.

Remember to write on your calendar that Monday, June 13 is ASAT day—everything you always wanted to know about ASAT's and were afraid to ask.

You will shortly be receiving another "Dear Colleague" in the mail with a fact sheet attached, summarizing the pros and cons of ASAT's. I urge my colleagues to give this issue the consideration it deserves.

I include the Washington Post editorial on antisatellites for insertion in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REAL SPACE WAR

President Reagan's proposal of last March to study shooting down Soviet missiles in space anticipated a time and a technology far in the future. But another kind of "space war" is becoming possible in the here and now: weapons to shoot down the satellites on which both great powers increasingly depend for communication and intelligence. The Soviet Union already has launched (non-nuclear) weapons meant to kill low-orbiting American satellites. The United States is ready to flight-test its own first satellite killers. A down payment of \$19 million, on a program that could yet cost billions, is due to be voted on in the House this week.

It is a serious business. One side's possession of effective anti-satellite weapons could theoretically let it "blind" the other—deprive it of the means to control its own strategic forces and detect its foe's. Just the fear that one side might attempt such a blinding strike in a crisis could force decisions of irreversible consequence. Yet Moscow and Washington have been unable to take the risk in hand.

Carter-era negotiations tripped over verification, among other things. Anti-satellite weapons, it turns out, are small and light and can be launched as easily and quickly as the satellites they are aimed at. A relative handful of them could threaten a major share of a great power's missile-detecting or guiding satellite capacity, making reliable verification essential.

The Carter administration had hoped that a discreet brandishing of American technological capacity, combined with active negotiations, would induce Moscow to rein in its own anti-satellite work. This policy did not fare well, and now the Reagan administration is heading toward deployment of the first American satellite killers. At the same time, it hangs back from resuming negotiations.

The new American weapons are considered to be substantially superior to the Soviet weapons already in orbit. We should proceed with caution in deploying them. Meanwhile, a new approach to negotiations should be devised. Reagan officials say talks should not resume until the United States is "ready with verifiable proposals that will enhance national security." Why is the administration, in its third year, not ready? If it is too hard now to negotiate limits on deployment, why not try to limit tests? In this branch of weaponry as in others, the administration has yet to find an effective, confidence-inspiring balance of arms building and arms control.

INTRODUCTION OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT BILL

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

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill permitting the capital punishment penalty for certain Federal crimes, and to allow a life sentence without parole for those capital cases where the death penalty is not sought. The intention of my legislation is to clearly establish the constitutional procedures whereby the imposition of the death penalty would be allowed.

The Members of this body are aware that there are a number of Federal crimes now on the books which already carry the death penalty. The Supreme Court itself has ruled in favor of capital punishment in several specific instances. A decade of decisions by the High Court, though, has clearly shown that certain specific standards must be met before capital punishment can be imposed. My legislation is aimed at meeting these objectives.

By approving responsible guidelines, we remedy the unconstitutional delay in carrying out these sentences.

The standards to be met are laid out clearly in this bill. Under it, a separate sentencing hearing will be held after a guilty verdict has been rendered for a crime which carries the death penalty. The penalty must be appropriate to the gravity of the offense. Aggravating and mitigating circumstances must be considered. The penalty must be discretionary rather than mandatory. All reasonable requirements are clearly presented.

The purpose of the provision is to insure that while there are sufficient guidelines to guard against complete discretion in imposing a death sentence, there is also assurance that each case will be considered individually in light of aggravating and mitigating circumstances. It is important, again, to note when considering legislation on capital punishment that the Supreme Court has never declared the death penalty itself unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, an important byproduct of the introduction of this legislation and other similar legislation addressing this issue is the focus it gives on the need for a death penalty. We, as our Nation's legislators, have a special duty to show support for the imposition of the death penalty in certain cases—as well as life sentences without parole. In doing so, we support our basic belief that it is society's primary responsibility to protect its members so that they might live in safety.

This is an issue which deserves the widest attention and discussion, for it is one which goes to the heart of our

moral and societal order. Murder is the foremost breach of that order.

I wish to stress that this legislation would not automatically call for the death penalty in each instance where there had been a killing. The death penalty would be considered only in a limited number of cases where the killing had been "in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner." By that, I mean that the circumstances, for example, involved torture, the deliberate prolonging of suffering, or severe physical abuse.

Is there then a crime so wanton, so horrible as to justify the imposition of the death penalty? Both the late Senator John L. McClellan in debate in 1974, and Senator STROM THURMOND in his statement earlier this year made when introducing his own comprehensive legislation to establish constitutional procedures for the imposition of the death penalty, provided examples of crimes so grievous that the death penalty is the only appropriate response.

I will take the liberty of repeating some of these examples here, for they illustrate my point in a graphic way:

What other punishment is "just" for a man, found to be sane, who would stab, strangle and mutilate eight student nurses?

What other punishment is "just" for men who would invade the home of members of a rival religious sect and shoot to death men, women and children, after forcing a mother to watch as her three young children were drowned?

What other punishment is "just" for people who would force a 24-year-old woman to douse herself with gasoline so that they could turn her into a human torch and watch as she burned to death?

What other punishment is "just" for a man with an incredible history of violence, rape and murder, who caps his vicious career by getting a young woman with her three children to stop in response to his pretense of a disabled car and who rapes and kills her and then drowns her three children in a creek?

Mr. Speaker, I must echo the statement of Senator THURMOND and others, that "people who commit crimes like these have forfeited their own right to life."

I am aware that there is some debate regarding whether or not capital punishment is an effective deterrent against crimes as reprehensible as those described above. There is testimony supporting both sides of that debate. However, my major focus in supporting a death penalty does not rest on the argument of possible deterrence alone. It rests on my belief that such a penalty is justified because in some cases it is simply just. It may or may not deter others, it will not bring the victim back, but it is a legitimate expression of the moral outrage felt by a society whose moral fiber is based on law. The type of action against which this bill is directed is that which is so repulsive as to threaten to undermine the fabric which binds us as a

civilized society. As the Supreme Court stated in the case of *Gregg v. Georgia*, 42 U.S. 153 (1976):

In part, capital punishment is an expression of society's moral outrage at particularly offensive conduct. This function may be unappealing to many, but it is essential in an ordered society that asks its citizens to rely on legal processes rather than self-help to vindicate their wrongs.

And again,

The instinct for retribution . . . serves an important purpose in promoting the stability of a free society governed by law. When people begin to believe that organized society is unwilling or unable to impose upon criminal offenders the punishment they "deserve," then there are sown the seeds of anarchy—of selfhelp, vigilante justice, and lynch law.

According to the "Uniform Crime Reports" for the year 1982, there was one violent crime committed every 24 seconds, including a murder every 23 minutes, forceable rape every 6 minutes, one robbery every 55 seconds, and one aggravated assault every 49 seconds. Since 1977, the number of murders increased by almost 20 percent. Crime index offenses are up 22 percent and the rate per 100,000 inhabitants is up 15 percent. Indeed, as we perceive an increasing lawlessness and brutality in our communities, there is an increasing number of Americans who support the death penalty for murder. A March 1981 Gallup poll indicated that two out of every three—or 66 percent—favor the death penalty, up from 49 percent just 10 years ago. The 1981 figures represent the apex of a steady uptrend in their sentiment over the last decade.

If human life is indeed precious, then the law which forbids the taking of human life must be a most awesome expression of society's revulsion for any violation of this tenet. This is a legitimate function of the death penalty, and it has been so supported by the Supreme Court.

Through our acceptance of sound laws providing for capital punishment and life imprisonment without parole, we promote respect for the criminal justice system and for human life. We express society's judgment that certain crimes, to quote Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart, "are in themselves so an affront to humanity that the only adequate response may be the penalty of death."

We must make the clearest statement that the abhorrent type of behavior I described earlier absolutely will not be tolerated, that those who violate this precept will be dealt with surely and severely, and that this behavior may well mean that they forfeit their own right to live.

THE NEXT MOVE IS MOSCOW'S

(Mr. LAGOMARSINO asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in today's lead editorial in the Los Angeles Times, they praise the President's arms control arrangement announced yesterday. The Los Angeles Times has not exactly been in the forefront of those leading the cheers for Ronald Reagan so I think it is significant as to what they have said.

The title of the editorial is, "The Next Move Is Moscow's."

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, June 9, 1983]

THE NEXT MOVE IS MOSCOW'S

The Administration's new bargaining position at the strategic arms reduction talks in Geneva opens the door to serious negotiations and ultimate agreement if the Soviets are willing, as they say they are, to establish a new, lower balance in long-range nuclear weapons on each side.

In announcing a major change in the original U.S. proposals at the START negotiations Wednesday, President Reagan pointed out that the new package reflects suggestions urged on the Administration by the Scowcroft advisory commission and by key members of Congress.

Noting that U.S. negotiator Edward Rowny has been instructed to be flexible in exploring any new proposals by the Soviet side, Reagan urged Moscow not to allow "this new opportunity to be lost."

The new U.S. proposal aims at a U.S.-Soviet agreement based on warheads instead of missile numbers in order to encourage both sides to move toward reliance on single-warhead strategic nuclear missiles and away from their more threatening, destabilizing arsenals of multiple-warhead missiles.

Soviet leader Yuri V. Andropov has expressed an interest in the warhead-counting approach to an agreement on Euromissiles, which is being negotiated separately. It remains to be seen whether Moscow is willing to extend the same principle to limitations on intercontinental-range missiles.

The Soviet Union has 2,348 long-range, strategic nuclear missiles compared with 1,572 on the American side. Because of their emphasis on extra-heavy missiles, the Soviets have an almost three-to-one advantage in throw-weight—the combined weight of the warhead and guidance devices. They also have a narrow lead in missile-deployed warheads.

The numerical advantage passes to the United States if you include our B-52s but exclude the Soviet Backfire bombers.

Reagan's original START proposal called on each side to reduce its arsenal of missile warheads by roughly one-third, to 5,000—no more than one-half of which could be land-based. It would have limited each side to 850 land- and sea-based ballistic missiles. The question of bombers and cruise missiles was left open.

This proposal was criticized by the Soviets and some U.S. analysts because it would have required the Russians to accept a greatly disproportionate cut in their land-based missiles. (This would not be true, it should be remembered, except for the massive Soviet buildup in land-based missiles in recent years.)

In any event Reagan, responding to public and congressional pressures for a more flexible posture, has now altered the U.S.

proposal to make things easier for the Soviets.

The President sticks by his proposal for a reduction to 5,000 strategic warheads on each side as a negotiating goal. But he abandoned the ceiling of 850 missiles. The new figure has not been disclosed, but is said to be around 1,200—which should be within negotiating distance of the Soviet proposal of a 1,450-missile ceiling.

Reagan says that his Administration is giving priority attention to incorporating congressional proposals for a "build-down" provision under which each side would destroy two existing nuclear warheads for each new one deployed.

Earlier, the sincerity of the President's interest in arms-control agreements was open to question. Having made the changes in the U.S. negotiating posture that critics called for, he must now be given the benefit of the doubt.

The fact is that the new proposal is extremely open-ended. It is not a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. The Soviets, for example, are invited to make their own choice between directly addressing the problem of unequal throw-weights or taking care of it in limitations on missiles and warheads.

Reagan's proposal is fair, reasonable and flexible. The next move is the Russians'.

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND RETIREMENT SECURITY ACT OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CORCORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORCORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to amend the Internal Revenue Code to increase the limits on Individual Retirement Account (IRA) contributions and to increase the IRA contribution limit available to homemakers and lesser earning spouses.

I know I speak for all of my colleagues when I express my continued concern about the state of our economy. We are beginning to climb out of the recession that has plagued our Nation for the last several years, although the path is long and hard. We all want to do what we can to speed the recovery, but it is imperative that we do this without spurring inflation and driving interest rates up again, putting into motion yet another disastrous cycle of stagflation. A very direct means of accomplishing this is through expansion of IRA's.

Individual retirement accounts provide a generous bounty. They enable Americans to better provide for retirement, and in so doing, they reduce the pressure on private retirement plans and social security to provide total retirement protection in later years of life. IRA's increase personal savings over the long haul, providing an excellent source for additional capital to fuel private sector growth. And by increasing available capital, they reduce the pressure toward higher interest rates. Although IRA's reduce revenues to the Treasury in the short run, the money saved is taxed upon dispersal.

Thus, it is a revenue deferral, not a revenue loss. Best of all, IRA's work. People understand them and use them.

The rate of personal savings in the United States is a disgrace when compared with other industrialized, free nations. In 1981, Canadians saved 12.4 percent of personal income, West Germans saved 15.3 percent, Japanese saved 19.8 percent, and Americans saved a paltry 6.4 percent. The results are that money is tight, interest rates are high, people are unable to buy homes, and businesses are unable to finance growth or even maintain existing operations. People are forced to rely more on social security and private pension plans than they would like to. Benefit changes and plan foldings become crises of existence.

My bill provides an avenue for addressing these problems. The Economic Growth and Retirement Security Act of 1983 will gradually increase the amount individuals can invest in IRA's. The current \$2,000 maximum contribution will be raised to \$3,000 in 1984, \$4,000 in 1985, and \$5,000 in 1986. This will have the salutary effect of increasing long-term savings in the United States, putting downward pressure on interest rates and increasing available financing.

In addition, to help provide for the many people who most need help in retirement as they have little or no retirement protection of their own, my bill modifies the method by which IRA contributions are determined. Under existing law, an individual can contribute a portion of gross income not to exceed \$2,000 each year to an IRA. For spouses with no income, the primary wage earner can contribute \$250 per year; \$250 per year. Is it any wonder that the women who raised us and the women who are raising our children make up the vast majority of the elderly poor? And they will continue to do so unless we begin to recognize the value of their contributions.

My legislation provides that the lesser earning spouse will be able to draw on the gross income of the primary wage earner in funding an IRA, to the extent that the primary wage earner does not contribute all of his or her gross income to his or her own IRA. For example, if the primary wage earner earns \$15,000 gross income and the secondary wage earner earns \$1,000, under existing law, the primary wage earner can contribute up to \$2,000 to an IRA. The secondary wage earner can only contribute a maximum of \$1,000. Under the Economic Growth and Retirement Security Act, if the primary wage earner put the maximum \$3,000 in 1984 in an IRA, the secondary wage earner would be able to draw on the remaining \$12,000 gross income to increase his or her IRA to the \$3,000 maximum. Likewise,

if the spouse earned no wages, he or she would be able to contribute the maximum \$3,000 from the remaining \$12,000 gross income.

It is time that we acknowledge the need to encourage saving, to encourage the development of personal retirement plans, and to provide for those of us who have had no opportunity to prepare for retirement with dignity. As a question of national policy, it is apparent that all of these goals are necessary to a healthy nation. As a question of efficiency, IRA liberalization addresses these goals more directly and more thoroughly than any other means. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and to support it at the first opportunity. The language of this bill follows for my colleagues' information.

H.R. 3266

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Growth and Retirement Security Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR DEDUCTIONS FOR RETIREMENT SAVINGS ON BASIS OF EARNED INCOME OF THEIR SPOUSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (c) of section 219 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special rules for certain married individuals with regard to deduction allowable for retirement savings) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) **SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an individual described in paragraph (2) with respect to the taxable year, the amount of the limitation determined under subparagraph (B) of subsection (b)(1) shall be the sum of—

"(A) the compensation (if any) includible in such individual's gross income for the taxable year, plus

"(B) the compensation includible in the gross income, for the taxable year, of such individual's spouse reduced by the amount allowable as a deduction under subsection (a) to such spouse for such taxable year.

"(2) An individual shall be described in this paragraph if—

"(A) such individual files a joint return for the taxable year, and

"(B) the amount of compensation (if any) includible in such individual's gross income for the taxable year is less than the compensation includible in the gross income, for the taxable year, of such individual's spouse."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION FOR RETIREMENT SAVINGS FROM \$2,000 TO \$5,000 IN 3 STEPS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of subsection (b)(1) of section 219 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to maximum amount of deduction for retirement savings) is amended by striking out "\$2,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000".

(b) **PHASE-IN OF INCREASE IN LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION.**—In the case of taxable years beginning in 1984 or 1985, there shall be substituted for the \$5,000 amount in subparagraph (A) of section 219(b)(1) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), amounts determined as follows:

Taxable years beginning in:	Amount:
1984	\$3,000
1985	4,000.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 408 and section 409 of such Code (relating to individual retirement accounts and retirement bonds) are each amended by striking out "\$2,000" each place such term appears in the following provisions of such sections and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,000":

- (A) Paragraph (1) of section 408(a).
- (B) Paragraph (2) of section 408(b).
- (C) The last sentence of section 408(b).
- (D) Section 408(j).
- (E) Paragraph (4) of section 409(a).

(2) **PHASE-IN OF INCREASE IN AMOUNTS UNDER PARAGRAPH (1).**—In the case of taxable years beginning in 1984 or 1985, there shall be substituted for the \$5,000 amount in each provision described in paragraph (1), as amended by such paragraph, amounts determined as follows:

Taxable years beginning in:	Amount:
1984	\$3,000
1985	4,000.

(3) INCREASE IN AMOUNT EXCEPTED FROM TAX TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTION RULE.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subparagraph (A) of subsection (d)(5) of such section 408 of such Code is amended by striking out "\$2,250" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$5,250".

(B) **PHASE-IN OF INCREASE UNDER SUBPARAGRAPH (A).**—In the case of taxable years beginning in 1984 or 1985, there shall be substituted for the \$5,250 amount in subparagraph (A) of section 408(d)(5) of such Code, as amended by subparagraph (A), amounts determined as follows:

Taxable years beginning in:	Amount:
1984	\$3,250
1985	4,250.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section, and the amendments made by this section, shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1983.

BUDGET DEFICITS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CAMPBELL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body would agree with me that the projected budget deficits are excessive, to say the least. It is obvious that we must reduce the deficits if we are to have a sustained economic recovery.

There are many examples of how the deficit is damaging our economy. As we all know, the FHA rate for home mortgages was recently raised to 12 percent from 11½ percent because of looming large deficits, and although interest rates have dropped considerably in the last 2 years, consumer loans and home mortgages rates remain at unacceptably high levels because of the projected deficits.

Many concerned citizens, businessmen, associations, and Members of this body have called for a reduction in the projected \$200 billion deficits. There has also been an overwhelming amount of debate and literature on

the best way to reduce the deficits. In fact, some groups that have traditionally supported large Federal programs and increased Federal spending are re-evaluating their policies because of the lopsided Federal balance sheet.

We have made changes in the social security system and other areas that have resulted in budget savings. And while I certainly support a major increase in defense spending, I also believe that we have taken a necessary step by reducing that increase to a real growth rate of 5 or 6 percent. The mistake that was made, I believe, was not applying the savings from this reduction toward the deficit, instead of increasing domestic spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Congress must reduce the deficits. However, there has been a considerable amount of objection to new taxes, elimination of recent tax reforms, and cuts in Federal spending. In part, I agree with this objection—new taxes through elimination of existing reforms could abort the economic recovery. How then are we to achieve reduced deficits?

I believe that one of the causes of these enormous deficits is the indexing of entitlements which often causes increases that are greater than the wage increases of working Americans. Indexing entitlements has also left little flexibility for Congress to provide adequate funding for important discretionary programs such as rehabilitation, education, and job training—programs which, in my opinion, actually need funding increases. As Congress instituted more and more entitlement programs, we abdicated our control over a vast portion of Federal spending. Adding automatic COLA's exacerbated the problem dramatically. As a former member of the Appropriations Committee, I was continually frustrated by our committee's lack of control over three-fourths of the Federal budget. These so-called uncontrolables must be brought under control for two reasons: One is to reduce the huge deficits, and two, we need to regain control over the Federal budget. If this does not transpire in the near future, Congress will be under even greater pressure to reduce already underfunded discretionary programs.

If entitlement programs were taken off of automatic pilot, then we could target resources better. For instance it might be better to fund a program to help people help themselves instead of merely maintaining them with an entitlement for subsistence as many of our programs do. Programs such as job training, vocational rehabilitation, handicapped programs, these are upward mobility programs that help people become self-sustaining.

Some of my distinguished colleagues would prefer to raise taxes to cover

the costs of these programs, while others favor reduced spending. I do not believe we can continue to raise taxes on the already overburdened taxpayer. I strongly support the third year 10-percent reduction in individual income taxes and tax indexing, and I recognize that it will be difficult to significantly pare spending for programs more than we already have done. However, the Democratic budget proposes large tax increases, large domestic spending increases, and large deficits, which in my opinion is not only misguided, but detrimental to the national economy.

I am sure that all of my colleagues are aware that tax indexing is scheduled to be implemented in 1985. As a proponent of this concept, I believe that taxpayers need to be protected from inflation just as entitlement beneficiaries are by COLA's. Indexing would provide this same protection by adjusting the tax tables to reflect increases in the inflation rate.

However, I believe that we can reduce the deficits by billions of dollars without cutting 1 cent from Federal programs and without imposing new taxes on the American taxpayer. Presently, all entitlement programs contain a 3-percent threshold on cost-of-living adjustments. In other words, if the inflation rate is 2.9 percent, a COLA is not awarded. However, if the inflation rate is 3.1 percent, the full 3.1-percent increase in benefits is given, since this is over the 3-percent trigger.

Tax indexing does not work in this manner. Under indexing, the tax tables will be adjusted to reflect any increase in the inflation rate.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these threatening deficits, I am suggesting that annual adjustments for both entitlement programs and tax indexing be tied to a 3-percent trigger and only that amount over 3-percent increase in the CPI be indexed. In other words, if the inflation rate is 8 percent, entitlement COLA's would be adjusted by 5 percent, and the tax tables would likewise be adjusted by 5 percent. This would have minimal impact on most people, but the savings from this adjustment in the COLA's and tax indexing is phenomenal.

Over a 4-year period, from fiscal year 1985 through fiscal year 1988, the savings resulting from the 3-percent trigger applied to tax indexing alone would be \$57 billion. The savings over the same period of time for the 3-percent trigger applied to entitlement programs would be \$68.5 billion. The total savings from the 3-percent triggers on the revenue and spending sides would be \$125.5 billion over a 4-year period. This is the kind of deficit reducer that our Government needs. We need to show the American people that this body is willing and capable of taking definitive and responsible

action by reducing these unacceptable deficits, and very frankly, I believe Americans would be willing to accept the impact on them, knowing it is across the board and fairly shared by both recipient and taxpayer.

This proposal recognizes that citizens and taxpayers need to be protected from the ravages of inflation. Inflation has been and may continue to be, a problem confronting our Nation—unless we implement a sound fiscal policy that incorporates lower deficits. Inflation is currently at its lowest level in many years, but based on the inflation projections of the Congressional Budget Office through fiscal year 1988, we can still save \$125 billion with this minor adjustment—even with inflation rates averaging in the low 4-percent range.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to carefully consider this proposal, and I challenge this body to take definitive action to reduce these excessive deficits but only through reductions in spending or a balanced approach. Without objection, I wish to insert a chart in the RECORD showing the projected savings from this proposal, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Tax Committee.

Savings when 3-percent adjustment is added to tax indexing (Joint Tax Committee projections).

Fiscal year:	Savings (billions)
1985.....	\$3.6
1986.....	10.0
1987.....	17.4
1988.....	26.0
Savings over 4 years.....	57.0

Savings from entitlement programs, including social security, when 3-percent adjustment is added to entitlement programs (CBO projections)¹

Fiscal year:	Savings (billions)
1985.....	\$5.1
1986.....	13.0
1987.....	21.1
1988.....	29.3
Savings over 4 years.....	68.5

¹ These figures do not include the 6-month delay in the COLA that was recently enacted. If this is factored in these projections, the savings are greater.

Note: Total savings for plan incorporating social security to \$125.5 billion (4 years).

Savings from entitlement programs, not including social security, when 3-percent adjustment is added to entitlement programs

Fiscal year:	Savings (billions)
1985.....	\$1.2
1986.....	3.8
1987.....	6.2
1988.....	8.8
Savings over 4 years.....	20.0

Note: Total savings for plan not incorporating social security is \$77 billion (4 years).

□ 1600

I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I would like to thank the gentleman for his remarks, remarks that I certainly adhere to. I would like to ask the gentleman to focus on one of his remarks. That was the subject of indexing.

I was wondering whether the gentleman agreed with me that by retaining the indexing feature of the Tax Recovery Act, the Economic Recovery Act, that we are in fact, protecting, most greatly, the lower and middle-income working people of this country who, after all, are the ones who have been paying an undue burden of the taxes for so many years. I was wondering whether the gentleman agreed with me on that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When we passed the changes in the tax law it was proposed—at that time I agreed with it—by the Democratic side that we reduce the top tax rate from 70 to 50 percent, in other words, cut the tax on the rich people.

Then we indexed. We had a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut that we tried to get. We wound up getting 23 percent. The rich have already gotten theirs. The middle-income American is the one that is due the next tax cut. Right now—this July. And we have to keep that. If we do not keep it, what you are doing is raising taxes on people who make under \$100,000 but over \$30,000 as a family. That is middle-income America. So we have to keep that.

Indexing protects lower and middle-income America. Those are the people who are being pushed up by bracket creep. I propose to keep all of that intact, but I propose to trigger it on the same basis that we trigger our entitlement expenditures.

Mr. PASHAYAN. In other words, does the gentleman agree that another way to phrase his very good remarks on what he was saying would be by saying that the upper income taxpayers are oftentimes already paying in the highest tax brackets anyway, so the bracket creep does not apply to them, but it does apply to the lower and middle-income families because they in fact are being pushed up and when they get a raise in their wages or salaries or income they lose more because they are pushed in a higher tax bracket than they gain in the increase in their wages, salaries or income because of inflation. And indexing, of course, protects them against that increased tax rate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. People who are in the top tax bracket do not gain anything on indexing. Indexing protects people who are climbing the ladder of success in the country.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Does the gentleman not find it strange then that many of those who oppose indexing

are the very ones who claim to be in favor of the middle-income wage earner; does the gentleman not find that rather strange? I do, at least.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find that to be rather strange. As a matter of fact, I think that once they examine it they may change their argument a little bit. Facts speak very loudly.

The truth is that people often oppose an idea without really knowing what it is. And when they make the argument that indexing helps people who are wealthy, then they are making exactly the wrong argument because it does not at all.

Mr. PASHAYAN. The gentleman mentioned they may change their arguments. I personally hope that they would change their minds rather than just the arguments.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is also interesting to me that the same people who do generally oppose indexing or oppose tax are generally the ones who vote for every spending program that comes through here. They also want to keep an automatic tax increase coming in.

Why do they want to keep that automatic tax increase? Because they do not have to vote a new tax and they can go home and say, "I didn't vote to raise your taxes even though I voted to spend all this money." Because it was automatically going up.

If we get off of automatic pilot just a little bit on our entitlements and on our taxes and we make the politicians start voting for the new taxes every time they have to put on a new spending program, we are going to have a whole lot more fiscal responsibility in this country.

Mr. PASHAYAN. The gentleman's statement has not only raised a lot of individual particular points but it was a grand sweep. Let me ask the gentleman to focus once again on something he mentioned and that is the impact of the third phase of the tax reduction that takes place on this July 1, just less than 30 days away.

Would the gentleman state perhaps in different words the effect that is going to have on middle-income taxpayers. This is a 10-percent reduction in their income taxes. And in particular could the gentleman highlight once again so we all make sure where we are on this just exactly why is it that this particular tax reduction is going to be relatively more favorable to the lower and middle income than to the upper income people.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would be glad to. First, let me say, when we started this the top tax rate was 70 percent. And it was proposed on the Democrats side that that be reduced to 50 percent. That helped everyone in the top tax brackets immediately right off the bat.

Mr. PASHAYAN. That was 2 years ago.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct. That was 2 years ago.

Then we changed again and we had our first tax cut of 5 percent which really was wiped out because there had been an increase in taxes for social security. Then we got our first 10-percent tax cut in place.

Now, the increase in social security taxes and bracket creep and all of these combined have virtually kept the taxpayer about even. This is the first real tax cut that the people, the average income American, working family of two, making in the low \$30,000 is going to get. If you take it away, that is who you are taking it away from. You are not taking it away from the guy making \$125,000 a year. He has already got his. He has already been cut. He was cut from the 70 to 50 percent. So this is middle-income America that they are talking about taking the tax cut away from.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Once again, does the gentleman not find it strange that many of those who would remove this very tax cut the gentleman has just so brilliantly described that would remove it from the law, are those same people once again not unlike the indexing feature who claim to be the champions of the lower and middle-income working people of this country, does the gentleman not find that a little on the strange side?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I find that extremely strange and there is no question that they try to parade as that. However, I think that the American people are beginning to realize that you just cannot continue to soak middle America in order to spend for every program that people dream up in the Congress of the United States.

My grandmother told me when I was a little boy, she said:

"If you go through life trying to spend your money on what you need instead of what you want you will always have some that you have saved for a rainy day."

And I really did not understand what all that meant as a little boy.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I was given the same advice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But I will tell the gentleman right now, we spend on what we want, not on what we need in this country often and we need to get back to that old principle of spending for needs and needs only.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Or at least a better balance than we have today.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Certainly a better balance.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. And once again, not to elongate this, I think the gentleman's statement is an important statement. I have heard many people say that they have not visibly seen any of the results of the income tax reduction over the last 2 years, but I think the gentleman is exactly right.

The reason they have not seen it was because the social security tax, payroll tax, was going up at the same time. I am sure the gentleman would agree—I do not mean to put the words in the gentleman's mouth—but I feel strongly that he would agree with me when I say that had it not been for the income tax reduction, the first two installments, the third of which as we say is coming on this July, but had it not been for those first two installments the overall effect on the income of the lower and middle-income worker would be their taxes would have gone up. And at least the income tax reduction permitted them to stay even.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct with one exception. The tax cut of the 25 percent which comes out to the 23 percent actually across the board allowed the working taxpayer making less than \$50,000 a year to stay even. The upper income taxpayer was reduced by the 70 to 50 percent reduction.

So had we not done that, the taxes on that taxpayer, on the working taxpayer, from around \$10,000 to \$50,000, would have gone up about 15 percent over the last 2 years.

Mr. PASHAYAN. During this 2 years, and in balance would have remained the same, but for the first two installments of the income tax reduction.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct. This one is an actual and real tax cut because it comes at a time that there are no new taxes going on for social security and other programs and inflation is at the lowest point that it has been in ages.

□ 1620

Mr. PASHAYAN. Well, once again I should like to thank the gentleman for his most timely remarks, and I think he has stated the proposition very well indeed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I hope some minds have been changed, owing to the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina, and maybe, because of the effort he has put in—I know he has put in considerable research—a few more in this town will acknowledge that it is desirable indeed for us to retain both this third phase of the income tax reduction and the indexing feature of the law.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We should retain them both, and if we trigger any type of index, apply it across the board, but any savings should be applied to the deficit until such time as we bring it under control, and then we can allocate our resources. You have to move a step at a time. The problem is that we have been in a position of wanting to continue to spend without ever

wanting to bring the whole thing under control.

Mr. PASHAYAN. It is perhaps a natural temptation. I think the gentleman is right, that we will have to take that away from ourselves, really.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is correct.

LEE L. VERSTANDIG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that this administration and the Nation will continue to enjoy the every able services of Lee L. Verstandig, newly appointed as Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs.

The recent accomplishments of Lee Verstandig are surely fresh in the minds of my colleagues. At President Reagan's request, he took charge of the embattled Environmental Protection Agency at perhaps its most turbulent period, first as Assistant Administrator for Legislation, and soon thereafter as Acting Administrator of EPA.

As Assistant Administrator, he quickly set about the task of restoring the Agency's public credibility, reestablishing a dialog with Congress, improving morale within the Agency, and strengthening its relations with State and local governments and environmental and business interest groups.

When he assumed the duties of Acting Administrator, he quickly put the Agency back on course, instituted an Agency-wide management reorganization, and prepared William D. Ruckelshaus for his Senate confirmation and transition to the Agency. It was an exceptionally complex task and required the talents of an exceptionally competent administrator.

Certainly it was not by accident that President Reagan selected Lee Verstandig for the difficult job at EPA. His outstanding record of accomplishments at the Department of Transportation had preceded him. As Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Governmental Affairs, under Secretary Drew Lewis, Lee Verstandig received extremely high marks for his direction of the Department's relations with Congress, State and local governments, and special and public interest groups, as well as its technology and assistance planning efforts.

He provided substantial input into the deregulation of the inter-city bus industry; enactment of landmark aviation legislation which will modernize the Nation's air traffic control system; transfer of the Maritime Administration to the Department of Transportation; and passage of the 1982 Surface Transportation Act, which will assist in improving the Nation's deteriorating transportation infrastructure.

The President's selection of Lee Verstandig as his assistant for Intergovernmental Affairs is a wise and altogether appropriate decision. His outstanding professional career covers an extremely broad range, stretching from his days as a member of the faculty at Brown University, to his service as administrative assistant to Senator JOHN CHAFEE, and eventually to a number of important posts in the executive branch.

Lee Verstandig's extensive experience uniquely qualifies him for his new position at the White House, and certainly his track record throughout an enormously successful public and academic career gives all of us reason to applaud his selection. ●

THE 10TH ANNUAL STAN MIKITA HOCKEY SCHOOL FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED

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

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring the attention of my colleagues to the 10th annual Stan Mikita Hockey School for the Hearing Impaired in Northbrook, Ill.

The school has been held each year for the last nine summers at an ice rink in the Chicago area. More than 250 boys and young men ages 9 through 24 have participated in rigorous training sessions coached by Chicago Blackhawk star Mikita, his former teammates Elmer "Moose" Vasko and Gene Ubriaco along with Chicago Blackhawk power skating coach Wally Kormylo, and Jeff Sauer, hockey coach at the University of Wisconsin, and other professional players from throughout the National Hockey League.

The Mikita Hockey School was not founded to produce professional quality athletes; its goal, instead, is to bring into the lives of the hearing-impaired a new confidence and understanding of their own abilities and those skills needed to prosper in their education and in their careers.

On June 17, 1983, the Chicago Park District in cooperation with the American Hearing Impaired Hockey Association and the McFetridge Parents Hockey Association will present the U.S. National Deaf Hockey Team versus Chicago McFetridge Patriots at the McFetridge Sports Center.

I congratulate the young players, their coaches, and all of those who are instrumental in the success of this program, and I send to all of them my warmest best wishes for many more years of success.

The names of the team members of the 1983 Stan Mikita Hockey School for the Hearing Impaired and the names of members of the Chicago varsity team follow:

CHICAGO PARK DISTRICT ALL STAR HOCKEY TEAM

McFetridge Hockey Team: Brian Wahnon, Jamie Parker, Chuck Wood, Brian Buicane, Steve Holter, Tim Daily, Ron Kifttel, Roger Pertynski, Dan Ilkich, Charlie Popov, Tony Orlando, Jeff Rollocheck, Phil Grace, Mike Waldron, Tom Keczenarek, Joe Calabresz, Bill Mologousise, Randy Johnson, Stan Dubicke, and Brian Dorfman.

TENTH ANNUAL STAN MIKITA HOCKEY SCHOOL FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED

Player and age:
 Brett Belzer, Glenview, Illinois 60025, 17.
 Phil Cachey, Oak Lawn, Illinois 60453, 18.
 Jim Cammarata, Mt. Prospect, Illinois 60056, 17.
 Alfred Casaccia, Encino, California 91436, 19.
 Bobby Cisluycis, Staten Island, New York 10302, 19.
 Cindy Cisluycis, Staten Island, New York 10302, 17.
 Johnston Cole, Glenview, Illinois 60025, 10.
 Michael Collins, University City, Missouri 63130, 16.
 John Dalton, Hull, MA 02045, 13.
 Sean Dee, Cheektowaga, New York 14215, 17.
 Michael DeVries, Madison, Wisconsin 53716, 20.
 Edward Gardner, Last Elmhurst, New York 11369, 18.
 Ken Gentzke, Eoneoye, New York 14471, 15.
 Elijah Gold, Ithaca, New York 14850, 12.
 Mark Grant, Brunswick, Maine 04011, 11.
 Eric Gross, Littleton, Colorado 80123, 9.
 Joseph Hartge, Bloomingdale, Illinois 60108, 15.
 David Hegarty, Newburyport, MA 01950, 12.
 John Hickey, Medford, MA 02155, 19.
 Robert Knox, Brunswick, Maine 04011, 14.
 Matthew Kraker, Amherst, MA 01002, 15.
 Bill Kwarciany, Jr., Gladstone, Michigan 49837, 15.
 Jeffrey LeRoy, Erie, PA 16508, 11.
 Kevin LeRoy, Erie, PA 16508, 14.
 James Liebrecht, DeWitt, Michigan 48820, 14.
 William Loftus, Summit, New Jersey 07901, 15.
 Paul Malaney, Norwell, MA 02061, 17.
 Michael Maynard, Madison, Wisconsin 53714, 13.
 Bill Mellen, Lowell, MA 01852, 18.
 Tony Meister, Buffalo, New York 14207, 18.
 Keith Mischo, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54303, 22.
 Gary Montalbano, Framingham, MA 01701, 19.
 Rick McGaughy, Holbrook, Massachusetts 02343, 21.
 Mick McLaren, Londonberry, N.H. 03053, 16.
 Marc Nash, St. Paul, MN 55105, 14.
 Kenneth Newman, Plymouth, Minnesota 55441, 21.
 Daniel Newman, Plymouth, Minnesota 55441, 15.
 Bobby Norton, Acton, Massachusetts 01720, 15.
 Anthony Pietranello, Staten Island, New York 10306, 18.
 Mickey Pilson, Ardsley, New York 10502, 18.
 Don Polaski, Rehoboth, MA 02769, 24.
 Carey Siegel, Chicago, IL 60645, 25.
 Jim Siciliano, Longmeadow, MA 01106, 18.

Wayne Smooker, North Patchogue, Long Island, N.Y. 11772, 18.

Ken Stehle, Florissant, Missouri 63033, 19.
John Stinson, Hayward, Wisconsin 54843, 13.

James Tourangeau, Gladstone, Michigan 49837, 14.

Jason Vendola, Orland Park, Illinois 60462, 13.

Wendell Waldroup, Jr., Lowell, Michigan 49331, 18.

Jason Weaver, Knoxville, TN 37914, 15.
Steve Young, Florissant, Missouri 63031, 17.

David Zimmerman, Minot, North Dakota 58701, 18.●

THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today's news brings with it word that two Israeli soldiers have been killed in Beirut. My heart goes out to these men, to their families. They were killed by a remote control bomb, dead because their heads happened to be exposed when the bomb was triggered against the armored vehicle in which they were riding. The incident is, of course, not the first, nor, tragically, will it be the last of killings in Beirut.

It is a reminder that we have yet to clearly delineate the American purpose in Beirut. We have yet to receive from the President and the administration any meaningful compliance with the War Powers Resolution, and with each passing day the danger grows greater.

What are our political objectives in Lebanon? And why is it necessary for our troops to be there? We need to ask ourselves here and now if we would be willing to endure warfare for the sake of whatever these objectives, yet undefined, are, for, as the military historian S. L. A. Marshall has written:

Disaster is less likely to derive from one gross blunder than from reasoned calculations which slip just a little.

In this case we do not know what the reasoned calculations are, let alone whether they are reasonable or not, whether they are supported by the people of this country, or whether indeed they are attainable without bloodshed.

Meanwhile, in Central America, events move apace. In the last few days there have been drastic diplomatic moves in which the Government of Nicaragua expelled two American diplomats because of their charge, quite absurd to us, that they attempted to poison one of their leaders.

But I think it stresses what I have been trying to say for months, and that is the fact that we do not perceive that part of the world as it really is. Right now the most popular novel best seller in Mexico—not Nicaragua, not Panama, but Mexico, our next door neighbor—is a novel depicting a

treacherous Mexican President who was compelled to sell out to the United States. The opening chapter shows a scene in which the President goes to his bedroom when he discovers a lethal poisonous breed of snake that is so excited that it had to have been imported into Mexico, and it turns out to be a CIA plot.

Now, this looks ridiculous to us. But this is the image, the perception, that exists now in Latin America, and not just in Mexico. And this is taken for granted. This, because of other things that have happened, many of which have never even been reported in our country, that this image and misperception of America on their part occurs to match our misperceptions.

But this Nicaraguan explosion, I think, glaringly and dramatically demonstrates this. For what is our reaction? We then tenfold the ante, this game of tit for tat, so that the Nicaraguans expel two of our ambassadorial-level diplomats and we come in and turn out 10 of theirs. And what is the reason we give? That these 10 Nicaraguan diplomats, ranging from New Orleans up to California and here, Houston, Tex., were conducting espionage against the United States.

Now, this really makes us the laughing stock of the world. What in the world could the consul in New Orleans, who, incidentally, has been now seeking refuge in our country, have been conducting by way of espionage? The latest hit on Basin Street Blues? I do not know. It just seems that a retaliation of this nature, for a small country, in effect, arrogates that country to a higher level than it deserves, and one which shows clearly the bankruptcy of our policy, if we can call such a thing a policy, this passes for administration conduct.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD the Richard Cohen column in today's Washington Post, which very, very eloquently brings out the situation, in which he points out what a silly game this is and how disadvantageous it is to the United States:

SILLY GAMES

(By Richard Cohen)

It is not all that important, I suppose what a government says when it engages in the game of tit for tat. This is the game being played by America and Nicaragua in which one country and then the other takes turns kicking out each other's diplomats.

It is a silly and depressing game, made all the more silly and depressing because merely by playing it, we lose.

The game started, you will recall, when Nicaragua accused three American diplomats of attempting to assassinate the country's foreign minister, Miguel d'Escoto, by passing him a poisoned bottle of brandy.

As assassination plots go, this one is so absurd as to be unbelievable—even if the CIA years ago did have a very clever plan to slip Fidel Castro a mickey to make his beard fall out. Still, the Nicaraguan charges are hard to believe.

But then so are the American ones. In retaliation for giving our three diplomats the boot, the State Department ordered Nicaragua to close its consulates in six U.S. cities—New York, Miami, San Francisco, Houston, New Orleans and Los Angeles—saying they had been used for spying. It expelled about 21 diplomats, a retaliation ratio, if there is such a thing, of about seven to one.

This is the game we have played for years with the Soviets, but as silly as it is, they are at least our size and their "spies" are very often the real McCoy.

Nicaragua is a different case entirely. It is a smaller country, in fact a very small one, which either by design or out of fear threw a clumsy insult our way and—to the reported consternation of its own people—got taken seriously.

By doing this, not only have we inflated Nicaragua's standing but we also have diminished our own by playing its game and saying things for which we are not willing to offer any evidence. After all, if these consulates were spy centers, why were they allowed to operate all this time and what exactly were the Nicaraguans spying on in New Orleans? Dixieland jazz?

If this sinking to the other guy's level were limited to mere rhetoric, it would be bad enough. But the administration seems determined to see much of Latin America through some sort of magnifying glass, blowing threats out of proportion and giving these regimes a standing and popularity that they would otherwise not have. The Sandinista regime in Nicaragua is either a brat or a paranoid of a regime, but it is not exactly a world power.

Nevertheless, it has somehow become public enemy number one, so threatening to hemispheric peace that the arrival of every Soviet boat is photographed from above and defensive artillery is shown to the American people as if it were MXs aimed at Lafayette Park. So great is the perceived danger that our government has been frank about its intentions. The Sandinista regime has to go.

In fact, all across the board we are yelling and screaming about countries that until recently were considered little more than settings for dippy musicals and whose most lethal weapon were rum drinks.

Now one kind of naivete has been replaced by another. Grenada all of a sudden is an enemy, armed to the teeth with, of all things, a world-class airport. Surinam, a thuggish regime to be sure but hardly a threat, has got to go and Castro has been turned into some sort of tropical version of the Godfather—up to his beard in the dope traffic.

All of this has made wonderful headlines. None of this, though, has been proven. The distinction between truth and propaganda has become blurred and a great government has engaged in shouting matches on late-night television with representatives of governments no one ever heard of. Sometimes, it seems that the fate of the Western Hemisphere will be settled on Nightline.

There is a total loss of perspective here, no recognition of who we are and what we stand for. We are paying our adversaries compliments by our willingness to adopt their tactics, treating them as major threats. We match their machismo with ours—and then some—fighting their fight on their terms. It is a fight we can only lose. After all, we are better than they are. It is time we acted that way.

Even as these events have been unwinding, the President has sent more

troops to Honduras, there to greatly increase the training activity on behalf of Salvadoran troops and thus slip by questions and concerns about our commitment in El Salvador.

I am reminded, with all of this, of the war powers resolution, as I have been trying to bring out, because it arose from Presidential blunders and miscalculations.

Ten years ago the Congress realized that open-ended military commitments, made unilaterally by our Presidents, could lead to catastrophe, as happened in Vietnam and a couple of other places.

Those who do not remember history so well say that Congress passed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and so was a party to the commitment of troops to Vietnam later. But the fact is that these are individuals who are ignorant of the circumstances of the consideration and approval of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

I happened to be right here on this floor at that time, and I raised, I think about the only questions to the then chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Dr. Morgan of the great State of Pennsylvania. What these individuals do not realize and do not remember is the fact that months passed between the resolution's approval, which, as explained to me by Dr. Morgan, was seen and understood as routine backing for possible retaliatory action and nothing more, at the most, and, at the request of the President, who was asking for moral support, under the shadow of an action against our national interest in the then charged attack on one of our ships in the bay.

When I read the language of the resolution, the plain import of the language, I became troubled, and I went to Dr. Morgan and I asked him about it. The exact words I used were these:

"Hey, Doc, what is the meaning of this resolution? Why are we having to pass it?"

I said,

This is mighty strong language. It looks to me like we are sanctioning a backdoor declaration of war.

The good chairman replied and said,

Do you want to deny Lyndon Johnson what we have given John Kennedy in the case of Berlin, President Eisenhower in the case of Lebanon?—coincidentally.

And I said,

What do you mean?

He said,

This is a pro forma resolution of moral support for the President under the exigencies of the moment.

I said,

Oh, in other words, this is an identical resolution to that which the Congress has passed in the cases you say of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy?

□ 1630

He nodded his head. I returned to my seat. At that time we did not have electronic voting, so I had plenty of time to look and ponder. They used to call the rollcall of every 435 names by voice twice. I was still in such grave doubt I returned to the chairman, but by then he was kind of short tempered and dismissed me and did not want to discuss anything further, so I came back to ponder what I should do.

Up to then nobody had voted "no" on the resolution. So I finally waited, because I was seriously considering voting "no," and then, feeling insecure in view of the explanation given by the chairman, I had great inward doubt, when finally the Clerk called the last name for the second time. So I then came to the well to be recognized in order to register my vote, Speaker McCormack chairing and presiding.

At that moment the doors burst open and Representative Adam Clayton Powell of New York rushed in. He saw me standing and he said, "Hey, what is this all about?" I tried to explain, as the Speaker was looking to me to recognize me, and under my breath I said, "Well, this is a resolution from the Foreign Affairs Committee." So the Speaker said, "The gentleman from New York," and Mr. Powell then looked around and he said, "Well, just vote me present," and walked away.

Then the Speaker recognized me and I voted "aye." If you look at the record for that day's vote, you will see that the only non-aye vote was Mr. Powell's who voted present, and that was the reason for it; not on the basis of any particular principle involved, but because he simply had come in late in time to register his vote, did not understand it, could not justify voting either way, so he voted present.

But this same resolution, because of what I felt then was a plain, obvious purport in content of the words, was used later by the then-Secretary of State under Mr. Johnson, to argue the case for the tremendous incursion by way of our troops into South Vietnam.

So these folks do not remember that there were months that passed between the approval of this resolution which, as I say, was considered pro forma, and the time when American troops actually landed in Vietnam in that form of combat units. That commitment was clearly beyond the political objectives understood by the Congress. It was probably also beyond the objectives of the President at the time he asked for the resolution. I do not think that President Johnson had the intent at that time to permit half a million troops to Vietnam.

Speaking for myself, I knew that the Government of France, for instance, and no government which had been engaged in Vietnam before, had committed formal troops, or much less

conscripts, to what they call Indochina. In fact, in 1950 the French Parliament passed an absolute prohibition against the use of conscripts. But we are the only country in the history of the world. Even the Romans in the time of their emporium, did not use free-born Romans. They did not impress them. They impressed slaves. England, at the height of its colonial empire, never conscripted to go and send the troops over to India, but we did. We sent conscripts, unwilling Americans, in an undeclared war.

Now, this was the issue that I single-handedly raised from the very beginning right here on this floor. The record will show that when the draft extension bill came up in 1967, I offered an amendment which, in effect, was really reiterating what the original conscription act of 1941 contained, and the only reason why it passed by one vote in 1941 was because the Congress, the House, put a clause saying that under no circumstances would an unwilling conscript be sent to serve outside of territorial United States then unless there was a declaration of war or specifically provided so by the act of Congress. That was the only issue I raised of any real persistence on my part.

No, I was not one of those that went around ranting and raving and yelling and doubling my fist and saying, "Hey, hey, LBJ; how many babies have you killed today?" But I did everything, as I am trying to do now in this case, to speak out.

I did join Senator Gruening, Ernest Gruening in the Senate, who was one of the outspoken opponents from the very beginning, with Senator Morse of Oregon, against what turned out to be our commitment in Vietnam, in a resolution in which we asked that the United States withdraw unilaterally and proceed only if we had what—a decent respect for the opinion of mankind by getting the United Nations to come in.

What I have been advocating since April 1, 1980, and mind you, that was not President Reagan, that was President Jimmy Carter, in the case of Central America, and specifically El Salvador, was for us to proceed under American leadership and exercise an American leadership collectively through the OAS, the Organization of American States, which I am still asking.

My position is that we ought to withdraw every single military and proceed under a combined multinational approach through the OAS. Our absence and our abdication of our responsibility of exerting leadership is a tremendous price, as history will show and as the future will develop unquestionably for this terrible, terrible abdication of leadership.

So we have created a vacuum, and into that vacuum have rushed five of

the surrounding countries: Mexico, Panama, Costa Rica, Colombia, and Venezuela. They call it the Contadora group. What do they say? You do not read anything about their meetings. They have already met five times to see how they can collectively initiate something to being about stability and peace in that area, stop the bloodshed. The bloodletting is terrific. Most of the bloodletting, 95 percent of it, is being committed with our arms, not with Cuban or Chinese. Oh, yes, some of them are arms that we left in Vietnam that have come back by way of Czechoslovakia and a few other countries, but they are American made. Both sides are killing 95 percent of the time, if not 99, with American-made armament.

So the point I am driving at is this: Congress allowed the war in Vietnam to develop because we failed to clearly define the authority we were giving the President. Later, Congress refused to accept responsibility for its failure. The Presidents have long, long, and even a Supreme Court decision, have long, long pointed out that the matter of foreign affairs is primarily the responsibility of the Presidents. That is true. And when Presidents do not get their foreign aid bill, they cry about it and exercise that power. And it is true. From the beginning, constitutionally and historically, the area of foreign affairs is primarily a Presidential terrain. However, the Congress cannot escape its part of the responsibility, for it has the control of the purse strings and also the constitutional power of the declaration of war. The President does not have it; only the Congress. And by indirection it has been delegated. That is the point I am trying to make. But the fact that Congress, at the critical time, does not define its responsibility does not lessen that responsibility later as the Presidents blunder.

□ 1640

Why is that? The reason is, and this has been true since we have had the history of mankind in warfare, no leader can lead a people into war if the people do not have the will, and the great people in a country such as ours can hardly be coalesced and unified in a cause that they themselves have not had explained or rationalized or clearly defined.

This is why I am speaking the way I am about our yet to be defined commitment in Lebanon and Beirut. When the President was asked, "Mr. President, how long are we going to have Marines in Beirut?"

He said, "I don't know. It depends on the Lebanese Government."

So that this again is precisely what is happening in Lebanon and in El Salvador today. We have not authorized any combat action, but there is every possibility of it and we have had casu-

alties. We have not defined the purpose or scope of these commitments. We have not suggested any limits, and so we invite the President to take us over into the abyss.

What every Member of the House must ask is this. If we had a son to serve, would we be willing that he die in Lebanon or in El Salvador?

We cannot morally by action or inaction commit any life to grave risk that we would not assume for ourselves. We cannot assume the cynicism of comfortable imperialists, a breed well understood by Menachim Begin, who wrote of his experience in the Irgun this way:

When a nation reawakens, its finest sons are prepared to give their lives for its liberation. When empires are threatened with collapse, they are prepared to sacrifice their non-commissioned officers.

In short, Congress cannot afford the luxury of saying that our commitments are nothing. We have to understand what they are and ask whether they are commitments we know will have the full support of all or most of all the people of this great country.

In the case of El Salvador, we know that the people of that country do not support any kind of incursion such as we have foisted, not the people.

We know that the people of this country do not support a military commitment. We know that there is not even much support for the aid that is already being extended. I have talked to Salvadorans who tell me that there are quite a number of cases in which the arms that we have sent to the government that this administration is supporting have been turned over by Army officers of the Salvadoran forces to the rebels, guerrillas, Marxists, whatever you want to call them.

What they tell me is, "Senor Gonzalez, if only your country would leave us alone, let us fight it out, this thing will be over with."

If not, there will be another 40,000 dead, as there have been already in just the smallest country in the area of the Western World, that is El Salvador.

We know that there is not much support even for that extended now, because our people also are well aware of that Government of El Salvador. It is certainly not being attacked by troops from other countries. There have been vague allegations about the importation of foreign arms, but no one yet has evidentiary facts to show that any Cuban soldier or Russian, much less, or any foreign troops are aiding and abetting the cause of the rebellion in El Salvador. There is no question about it at this point and up to now, an indigenous rebellion, just like the one in 1932.

Our people are well aware that not a one of us would choose to live under that kind of regime, which even today is more interested in murky power

struggles than in carrying out the horrendous task of rehabilitating and redeeming itself.

In the case of Lebanon, it is not likely that our people are very much aware even of the fact that we have troops, much less the likelihood that they will remain for another year and a half. That is just in Beirut.

I do not even hear a mention about the 2,000 airborne we have up the desert about 500 miles above Beirut.

Now, the big difference there is that the Congress committed them, an historical commitment, never before once done so by any Congress since 1789.

I doubt also that more than 1 in 100 or more than a handful of my own colleagues knows that American policy assumes a growing role for our troops in Lebanon during these immediate coming days and that the likelihood of attacks on our personnel will grow as this commitment grows.

I do not know of anybody in this Congress that has been given the details of the secret agreements made by our President, I presume, unless his Secretary of State has not communicated. It would not surprise me. That has happened before.

The extent, the content and the range of those secret agreements have still not been divulged, much less to the Congress that I know of; but I do know that they involve a tremendous exponential increase in the nature of our commitment. If, for example, Israeli troops leave Beirut, our troops are expected to patrol in areas now patrolled by them. It could just as easily have been an American group that was struck by yesterday's attack as it could have been, as it tragically was, but their mission is clear; ours is not, as is evidenced by the turmoil that existed here just a few minutes ago, even between components of the Israeli Army and the Marines—unimaginable, yet it happened.

Much more to the point, even in Israel itself, there is a devious feeling about the commitment in Lebanon. If the American role grows, if our soldiers then suffer, what is to be done? Had two marines died last night, what would our President be saying today? Would he be saying the same thing as after the destruction of the American Embassy with 16 American lives extinguished, and what was his reaction?

He said, "We are not going to let a bunch of murderers deter us. As a matter of fact, we will double our purpose"—whatever that is. "We will reinforce. We are not going to abandon."

That is fine, but that still does not define the role or the policy, and at that point would hardly be the time to ask the question. The time to ask is now, as I have been saying for the last weeks. The time to define roles is now. That is what we should have learned with the Bay of Tonkin resolution, to

ask questions before and not after the troops land on the beach, to define our purposes before we are committed and not to try to rationalize afterward, to ask ourselves the hardest questions of all. Is this the place? Is this particular political objective one that I would die for or be maimed for?

□ 1650

That is why we have had a war powers resolution adopted. That is why we ought to insist on using it now while it is being violated, before it is too late either in Lebanon or in El Salvador.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REFORM OF TRADE REMEDY LAWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means, which I chair, completed extensive hearings on possible options to reform our trade remedy laws. These hearings covered 7 full days and included testimony from administration officials, Members of Congress, domestic industries, importers, organized labor, retailers, trade lawyers, academicians, and several other interested persons. We heard dozens of recommendations relating to both administrative and legislative improvements. Many recommendations received widespread support, while others were more controversial in nature and seemed to appeal only to a narrow constituency. A vast majority of the witnesses, however, agreed that changes are now needed to make our trade remedies, particularly antidumping and countervailing duty laws, less costly, less complex, and more effective. Consequently, there are several possible changes in these laws which I am anxious to see made and which I believe the Committee on Ways and Means should report to the House.

The subcommittee staff is now in the process of cataloging and analyzing the large number of recommendations. Based on this review, I plan to introduce legislation implementing what I believe to be the most important and reasonable procedural and substantive changes to improve enforcement of these very important unfair trade laws. I believe that such changes will accomplish a number of important and necessary goals: to improve access to trade remedies for all domestic industries potentially affected by unfair trade; to provide a more administrable, less costly procedure for all groups, domestic and foreign; and to deter the spread of unfair trading practices by our trading partners, particularly such measures as industri-

al targeting and other subsidy schemes.

I believe that constant improvement and refinement of our trade laws presents the best hope for preserving an open, liberal trading system while at the same time confronting the spread of unfair foreign competition and the changing conditions of international trade.

The United States is generally recognized to have the fairest and most accessible system of trade laws in the world. This system, which is based on the simple but practical principle of "free but fair trade," has benefited us greatly. We must not dismantle it. We must, in fact, make certain that such laws remain evenhanded, objective, transparent, and consistent with our GATT obligations. But, we must also improve such laws to keep pace with the changing times and to carry out the job they were designed to do. Our recent hearings indicated a need for legislation—and I want to reassure my colleagues that I intend to act quickly in improving these laws so that we ensure the fair conduct of international trade and the competitiveness of American industries.●

CAN OUR ECONOMY PICK UP IF HOUSING IS DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, positive economic indicators have received much attention in recent weeks as each of us look for some signs of an economic turnaround. The health of the Nation's housing industry is generally agreed to be one of the most important indicators of long-term economic growth and recovery by all knowledgeable observers.

The decision by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to raise the FHA-VA interest rate from 11½ percent to 12 percent is a sign that the current upturn, while welcome indeed, may be shorter and less vigorous than needed.

The rise in the FHA-VA rate reflects the fact that the Department of Housing and Urban Development had pegged the rate artificially low in light of market conditions. The result was 7 or 8 points charged to sellers and homebuilders, a factor which discourages new loans.

The signs for a robust return of housing over the next 6 months are discouraging. An April conference board report indicates that only 2.6 percent of consumers plan on buying a home in that time period. This compares to 2.7 percent in March and 2.1 percent in April 1982.

The increase in interest rates undercuts one of the positive aspects of the generally discouraging announcement

of April housing starts. While starts for that month dropped by 8 percent, to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1.49 million, building permits rose 7 percent.

If interest rates continue to rise, it is a safe bet that builders will not make use of those permits.

What could be termed the housing undertow in our economy is a dangerous current that may determine whether we have a healthy recovery. A poor performance in the housing sector, it seems certain, is a critical indicator of what we may expect in other areas.

At this point, I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the Washington Post of June 8 which describes the mortgage interest rate increase and which includes the reactions of realtors, homebuilders and others:

[From the Washington Post, June 8, 1983]

FHA LIFTS MORTGAGE RATE TO 12 PERCENT

(By Ann Mariano)

The interest rate on FHA- and VA-insured home mortgages will be raised to 12 percent today, the Department of Housing and Urban Development said yesterday. The announcement touched off fears of further damage to the already faltering housing recovery.

The rate was cut only a month ago to 11½ percent, the lowest level in nearly three years. The new rate of 12 percent is for 30-year, level-payment loans, and the rate for graduated-payment loans is being raised from 11¼ percent to 12¼ percent.

The HUD announcement said the hike reflects events in the mortgage market, where interest rates have been creeping up in the past few weeks.

Both FHA Commissioner Philip Abrams and a spokesman for the nation's mortgage bankers attributed the increases—which have pushed rates on conventional loans to 13 or 13½ percent—to investors' fears that the federal budget deficit will continue to grow, eating up money available to borrowers.

The rate increase "stinks, that's what it does," said Michael Sumicrast, chief economist for the National Association of Home Builders. "We desperately need stability in the financial markets. We cannot have these ups and downs in the mortgage market. It upsets people; it upsets buyers."

Housing sales have slowed in recent weeks, and "it doesn't take very long to really upset the whole" housing recovery, Sumicrast said.

Sale of new one-family houses dropped to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 573,000 in April, down from a peak of 611,000 in January and from the March rate of 597,000, according to the Census Bureau and HUD.

A spokesman for the National Association of Realtors called the FHA-VA increase "very disappointing."

"Frankly it scares us, and I guess it ought to scare a lot of the general public," said the spokesman, Bill Atkinson. "What we are seeing . . . is the reaction of financial markets to the federal deficit. Congress and the administration are not making any headway on bringing deficits down."

Interest rates on conventional loans are dangerously near the 14 percent threshold

"above which mortgage demand gets choked off fairly quickly," said Mark J. Riedy, executive vice president of the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Before today's increase, closings on home sales already "were falling off and applications for loans had started to fall off," he said.

Many industry leaders say potential buyers are kept away by the high number of discount points being charged before today's rate increase.

Lenders want to sell the loans they make to investors in the secondary mortgage market, and they must produce a yield competitive with other types of investments to make these loans saleable. To produce the yield, lenders must give investors a discount, then lenders try to get this money back by charging points to either the home buyer's or seller's. A point equals one percent of the mortgage amount. Riedy said today's rate hike "probably knocked out at least 3 points in FHA and VA mortgages."

EQUAL PAY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LEHMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. Unfortunately, pay equity does not look much better than it did 20 years ago. In 1960, working women received 60.8¢ to every dollar earned by men. In 1981, women were making 59.2¢ to the male dollar. During a time of technological progress, we continue to economically oppress our female laborers. Whereas women comprise 43 percent of our work force, few have entered skilled blue-collar jobs where the Equal Pay Act would enable them to receive the high wages paid to men in these jobs. While all persons should be free to enter the occupation of their choice, they should also be able to expect payment based upon skill, effort, and responsibility rather than gender. There exist many reasons for the continued wage gap. Among these reasons are violations of the Equal Pay Act, lack of unionization among women, and job segregation.

In an effort to examine pay differentials, joint labor/management committees have been developed in many areas to evaluate job requirements and tasks. During an evaluation, points are assigned for designated work factors: skill, effort, responsibility, and working conditions. A consistent pattern of inequitably low pay for working women has been revealed in this process. In Minnesota, registered nurses—female dominated—and vocational education teachers—male dominated—both scored 275 evaluation points. The registered nurses' monthly salary was \$1,723, and the vocational education teachers earn \$2,260 per month. In San Jose, Calif., a senior legal secretary—female—and a senior carpenter—male—were both evaluated at 226 points. The senior legal secretary

made \$665 per month, while the senior carpenter made \$1,040 per month.

Equity in blue-collar jobs is most frequently secured by unions, but only 15 percent of all workingwomen are union members. These women earn 33 percent more than nonunion women. However, unionized women are often fired as "troublemakers" and replaced by nonunion workers.

Still, the most serious cause of the wage gap remains job segregation. Stereotypes about women's capabilities and the appropriateness of male and female jobs dominate the job market. Traditional educational and employment practices channel men and women into different jobs. Women are hired for traditional female occupations which too often do not offer opportunities for promotion.

On this 20th anniversary we should dedicate ourselves to the enforcement of the Equal Pay Act and make the promise of equal pay for equal work a reality in this country.

INTRODUCTION OF REVISED COMPREHENSIVE OIL SPILL LIABILITY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. STUDDS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Representatives JONES of North Carolina, YOUNG of Alaska, FORSYTHE, and BIAGGI, a revised bill to establish a comprehensive oil pollution liability and compensation scheme for the United States.

This bill reflects a compromise between H.R. 2222 and H.R. 2368, two pieces of legislation which had earlier been introduced on this subject, and contains sections of yet another, H.R. 2115, which had much in common with both of the other bills. The new legislation also reflects the testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation at its hearing on this subject on April 20.

Our decision to introduce a new bill dealing with oil pollution liability stems from the complexity of the legislation, and from the nature of the changes which have been agreed upon between myself and the ranking minority member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The large number of changes required in the text of H.R. 2222, the bill which I had earlier introduced, and H.R. 2368, Mr. YOUNG's bill, would have made the amending process unduly complicated and difficult for either Members or the public to understand. By combining our compromise text in one bill, prior to a planned subcommittee markup on June 21, we hope to permit other Members and interested persons to comment on the proposal in a timely way.

The following is a discussion, in outline, of the major issues which were considered in arriving at the text contained in the bill being introduced today.

FUND ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS

H.R. 2222 and H.R. 2368 both establish an oil spill liability and compensation fund. The fund is derived from the oil industry and thus complements the concept of strict liability. Both bills pay for essentially the same damages and cleanup. The major purposes of the fund is to be a backup for large spills not compensated for by a polluter under the limits of liability established by the legislation.

The major differences between the bills is the type of fund established. H.R. 2222 establishes a public fund in the Treasury administered by the Department of Transportation. Moneys would be raised through a tax on oil that would terminate in 5 years. H.R. 2368 establishes a private corporate entity to administer the liability and cleanup fund. It would be regulated by the Secretary of Transportation and is modeled after the existing private fund in the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Act. Moneys in this fund would be derived from a fee on oil. The fee would only be in effect when the fund falls below \$100 million. The money in the fund could be invested to increase the fund to \$200 million. Any excess investment income after that point would be rebated on a pro rata basis to the private entities who contributed to the fund. Generally, the private fund would have all the lawful powers needed to administer this fund and carry out its functions and duties, including the organization, staffing, procedures and other activities relating to the purpose of the trust fund. Finally, the private fund would be available to pay for immediate response for cleanup, claims for damage, the cost of administration, and the initial and annual contributions to an international fund if two global oil pollution conventions are adopted by the United States.

The new bill adopts the concept of the private fund in H.R. 2368 with modifications. One of the most important modifications relates to the composition of the board of directors of the trust fund. The number of board members would remain at nine but are distributed as follows: Three would represent those contributing to the fund, three would represent potential claimants to the fund, which would include, but not be limited to, State or local governments, and three would be required to have particular knowledge and experience in the field of oil spill liability and compensation. The terms of the directors would be raised from 3 to 6 years and the basis for removal from office would be expanded to include incompetence in addition to neglect of duty and malfeasance in

office. The level of the fund that triggers the fee mechanism would be raised from \$100 million to \$200 million and the level of the fund at which any rate of excess investment would occur would be raised from \$200 million to \$300 million. In addition, the availability of the fund for immediate payment of removal costs was added to the disbursement provision. Other restrictions and safeguards regarding the fund apply including the requirement for an independent annual audit to be reviewed by the General Accounting Office.

In H.R. 2368, the trust fund is responsible for designating a pollution source and, if the designated responsible party fails to act, advertises the designation and claims procedures. H.R. 2222 provides for the Government to carry out these functions.

The new bill basically adopts the approach in H.R. 2222 with regard to designation. The feeling is that the Government is in the best position to detect spills, or receive the notice of one, and to make the designation.

RELATION TO INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Both H.R. 2222 and H.R. 2368 include provisions to implement two international conventions dealing with oil pollution liability and compensation. The new legislation includes similar provisions, except that several modifications were made to reflect drafting assistance provided by the Coast Guard, and for the purpose of clarifying the intent of the text.

Provisions concerning the international conventions constitute a separate title IV in the new bill. Language has been included providing within the context of the conventions:

- (1) for a waiver of sovereign immunity from oil pollution claims submitted against U.S.-owned public vessels which are being used commercially;
- (2) for the implementation of financial responsibility requirements;
- (3) for the recognition by U.S. courts of judgements reached in the courts of other states;
- (4) for the location of the International Trust Fund, for purposes of venue, in the District of Columbia; and,
- (5) for required technical changes.

The intent of the authors of the legislation remains to exclude from the text of this bill any language contained in the two international conventions which is clearly self-executing in nature. The language included in the bill, therefore, is either essential to the implementation of the conventions by the United States, or necessary to clarify the method by which certain provisions would be implemented.

DEFENSES TO LIABILITY

H.R. 2222 and H.R. 2368, like much other pollution liability legislation, adopts a standard of strict liability for pollution incidents with certain specifically enumerated exceptions to that liability. These exceptions include in-

stances where a particular incident was caused by an act of war, by an overwhelming natural phenomenon, or by a third party.

The two bills differ, however, in the wording which determines the ability of a spiller to make use of a defense to liability. In H.R. 2222, the spiller—or "responsible party"—is liable unless an incident is caused solely by one of the causes listed as an eligible defense. In H.R. 2368, a responsible party may escape liability in all cases to the extent that an incident is caused by such a defense, a less stringent test.

The issue of defenses of liability was discussed in nearly all the testimony received during the public hearing on this legislation before the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation. The authors of this bill ultimately decided to accept a general recommendation contained in the testimony of a representative of the American Petroleum Institute:

The petroleum industry believes it to be paramount importance that uniform international tanker liability and compensation schemes be established.

Accordingly, the new legislation adopts language in its section on defenses to liability which closely mirrors that contained in the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage. The new language will require a responsible party, in order to escape liability, to prove that the incident—

(A) resulted from an act of war, hostilities, civil war, insurrection or a natural phenomenon of an exceptional, inevitable and irresistible character, or

(B) was wholly caused by an act or omission of a third party person other than—

- (i) a responsible party;
- (ii) an employee or agent of a responsible party; or
- (iii) one whose act or omission occurs in connection with a contractual relationship with a responsible party.

A responsible party is also permitted, with respect to a particular claimant, to escape liability to the extent that the economic loss from an incident was caused by the claimant.

One other change was made to this section in response to testimony received at the subcommittee's hearing. The Center for Law and Social Policy suggested that a responsible party be prohibited from making use of a defense to liability in the event he has failed to comply with his legal obligation to report the oil spill to the Coast Guard. This change has been incorporated into the new legislation.

LIABILITY LIMIT FOR OFFSHORE FACILITIES

The liability limit for facilities operating under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) is \$75 million in H.R. 2222, and \$35 to \$50 million in H.R. 2368. In the new bill, the liability limit will be set at \$50 million.

Establishing a proper limit on liability for offshore oil facilities is not an easy task. Experience indicates that

spills of significant size from offshore facilities are quite rare. Since the offshore oil pollution fund was created in 1978, for example, no claims for damages for spills from facilities have been filed. Nevertheless, the threat of a catastrophic spill from an OCS facility continues to exist. The Santa Barbara oil spill of 1969, and the IXTOC oil blowout of 1979 demonstrate the potential for an OCS spill to generate enormous pollution cleanup and damage costs.

It is not possible to establish a liability limit high enough to cope with a catastrophic spill, and yet also equitable given the excellent pollution safety record of the offshore oil industry, as a whole. The \$50 million figure included in this legislation is, therefore, a compromise which places a liability burden on all OCS operators sufficient to encourage them to demonstrate care in their operations, and which will certainly prove adequate to deal with all but the most serious incidents, but which is lower than that proposed in H.R. 2222.

SCOPE OF COVERAGE

H.R. 2368 applies to oil pollution incidents from vessels and from all oil storage, production and transportation facilities, whether located onshore or offshore. H.R. 2222, however, only covers pollution from vessels and from facilities licensed under the Deepwater Port Act, or which are being used in activities carried out under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The new legislation adopts the less comprehensive approach taken in H.R. 2222.

Good arguments can be made in behalf either of including or excluding from coverage onshore facilities and offshore facilities located in State waters. The decision to exclude is tentative, and the sponsors reserve the right to alter this provision as the legislative process moves forward. There is a need for greater input from the administration, from State governments, and from the private sector concerning the wisdom of applying a Federal oil liability and compensation scheme to facilities which might arguably better be dealt with at the State or local level, and which may already be satisfactorily covered under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. ●

PRESIDENT'S NEW ARMS CONTROL POLICY HOLDS GREAT PROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. NEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I received with cautious optimism the President's pronouncement that he has revised his instruction to his START negotiators to "reflect concerns and recommendations of the Scowcroft Commis-

sion, the Congress, and others." While endorsing the MX missile, the Commission underscored the critical need to reach an arms control agreement to help assure our national security. The President laid most of the blame for failure to reach an agreement thus far on the Russians, but appeared to concede that U.S. intransigence was also a factor. Indeed, he has instructed his negotiators to be more flexible at the negotiating table. This is a positive development, Mr. Speaker, and indicates that President Reagan may well join every other President since World War II in endorsing the importance of arms control.

Mr. Speaker, the President's public statement is heartening, but Congress and the American people will want to see substantive progress before long in reaching an accord with the Soviet Union. It is well understood, Mr. Speaker, that the President made a deal with Congress to alter his negotiating position in exchange for congressional support for development and testing of the MX missile. It should be clearly understood by the administration that continued congressional support for the MX is not assured. A great many Members of Congress, including myself, reluctantly voted for the missile on the basis of the President's promise to pursue arms control more vigorously. We intend to hold the President to that agreement.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, the President's attitude toward nuclear war and arms control could be characterized as nothing short of cavalier. The President and others in his administration spoke of firing nuclear warning shots, and the possibility that nuclear war is survivable and, indeed, winnable, even going so far as to characterize nuclear war as an unfortunate event. If the President has truly embraced the Scowcroft Commission in full, it represents a remarkable change in attitude and presents a real opportunity for reaching an accord with the Soviet Union and reducing the threat of nuclear war.

The text of the President's statement on his new arms control policy appeared in the Washington Post of June 9, 1983. It is important, Mr. Speaker, that his statement be made a part of the official public record. Therefore, I am inserting the full text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am also inserting the Post editorial that appeared in the same edition and which clearly states the meaning and promise of the President's new arms control policy.

The President argued strenuously that he required the MX missile to bargain with the Russians for reductions in the Soviet nuclear arsenal. Our hope, Mr. Speaker, is that the President succeeds in negotiating reductions in the Soviet nuclear arsenal and eliminates the need for the MX.

The text and editorial follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1983]

REAGAN OUTLINES NEW PLAN FOR ARMS REDUCTION TALKS: OUR GOAL IS TO MAINTAIN A STABLE NUCLEAR BALANCE IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE RISK OF WAR

(The text of President Reagan's statement yesterday on nuclear arms)

The Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, or START, officially resumed today in Geneva. I would like to speak for a moment about my hopes for these important negotiations and about changes which I have decided to make in our START proposal.

Such changes reflect concerns and recommendations for the Scowcroft Commission, the Congress, and others. They offer the prospect of new progress toward a START agreement.

Before discussing these specifics, I would like to comment on what I see as very positive developments taking place both here and abroad. I am happy to say that today there is a growing sense that we are making progress. I just met in Williamsburg with the leaders of the major industrialized nations, and I was struck there not only by the facts and figures pointing toward economic recovery, but also by a spirit of optimism and cooperation which was remarkable.

This same spirit is visible in our discussions of security issues. In NATO, as in our other alliances, there is a new feeling of partnership. The Atlantic alliance is alive and well, and its close consultations are a source of strength and participation for each of its members.

At least as important, and very gratifying to me, is the new spirit of bipartisanship on national security issues which is increasingly evident in both houses of Congress. When I established the Scowcroft Commission I could not then foresee the impact that this outstanding panel would have. Clearly, the commission's work, which went beyond MX to address critical issues of deterrence and arms control, has become a major stimulus to the rethinking of national policy.

The commission's report challenged some favorite assumptions, and called for changes in our strategic planning. At the same time, it expressed support for my administration's most heartfelt objectives in arms control: deep reductions, modernization for stability's sake, and the elimination of the first-strike threat.

I have pledged to Congress my full support for the Scowcroft Commission recommendations and my intention to incorporate them in our START proposal. So that we can continue to benefit from the wisdom of its counsel, I intend to ask the commission to continue to serve. Its bipartisan membership will thus be able to provide timely advice to me, both with respect to the adoption of its proposals into our defense program and our arms control policies.

In recent weeks, I and officials of my administration have had an extensive series of private meetings with many members of Congress. We have reviewed implications for the START negotiations of the Scowcroft Commission recommendations and also of the "mutual guaranteed build-down" advocated by a number of distinguished members of the Congress.

The review of our START position was capped by four recent meetings—three yesterday and one today. Yesterday morning, at a meeting of the National Security Council, my senior advisers and I reviewed major implications and options. We also considered a range of congressional viewpoints.

Yesterday afternoon, I met with groups of senators and congressmen whose interest and expertise in arms control I value highly. I discussed with them the major issues before us. This morning, I met with the leadership of both houses of Congress. And throughout the START negotiations, the administration has consulted with our allies.

Three full rounds of START negotiations are now behind us. It is my judgment that these rounds have been useful and have permitted us to cover necessary ground. However, due largely to Soviet intransigence, we have not yet made meaningful progress on the central issues.

I remain firmly committed to take whatever steps are necessary to increase the likelihood of real, substantive progress towards an agreement involving significant reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear arsenals, and in the national security interests of both sides. Above all, our goal is to maintain a stable nuclear balance in order to reduce the risk of war. Our efforts in the START negotiations must be guided by that objective.

The report of the Scowcroft Commission offers us a new opportunity for progress. It has provided a consistent and coherent framework to guide our thinking about the fundamental elements of our national security policy—deterrence, defense and arms control. But, more than that, it has provided the basis for renewed, bipartisan support for that policy.

To capitalize on this critical opportunity and on the basis of the widest possible range of advice, I have directed new steps toward progress in achieving real arms reductions at the START negotiations. The purpose of this guidance, provided to Ambassador Ed Rowny, our chief START negotiator, is to adjust the U.S. START position to bring it into line with the Scowcroft Commission's recommendations and to provide additional flexibility to our negotiators in pursuing our basic goals.

Although we have put forth a comprehensive proposal on limiting strategic ballistic missiles and bombers, our primary aim in the START negotiations has been, and continues to be, to reduce the threat posed by the most destabilizing systems, namely ballistic missiles. To achieve that aim, measures that constrain the number and destructive capability and potential of ballistic missile warheads are essential.

Our proposed limit of 5,000 total ballistic missile warheads—a reduction by one-third of the current level—remains the central element of the U.S. START position.

The U.S. START position tabled in previous negotiating rounds includes another constraint. It would have limited each side to no more than 850 deployed ballistic missiles. This measure was never viewed as being as useful or important a constraint as the limit on total ballistic missile warheads.

The Scowcroft Commission report specifically suggested that it should be reassessed since it could constrain the evolution we seek toward small, single-warhead ICBMs.

Acting upon the Scowcroft Commission's recommendation, I have now directed our negotiators to adjust our position on deployed ballistic missiles by relaxing our current proposal for an 850 deployed ballistic missile limit.

At the same time, the U.S. remains firm on the point that the destructive capability and potential of ballistic missiles must be addressed in START.

Our current position includes a network of constraints designed to lead to a more stable

strategic balance at reduced force levels—while addressing the destructive potential of missiles.

The Soviets and others have complained that these constraints are designed to dictate Soviet force structure according to U.S. standards. This is not the case. We believe, as does the Scowcroft Commission, that stability can be increased by limitations on the destructive capability and potential of ballistic missiles. As a consequence, we will continue to propose such constraints which indirectly get to the throw weight problem while making clear to the Soviets our readiness to deal directly with the corresponding destructive capability if they prefer.

There may be more than one way to achieve our objective of greater stability at reduced levels of arms. So I have instructed Ambassador Rowny to make clear to the Soviet delegation our commitment to our fundamental objectives, but I have also given him the flexibility to explore all appropriate avenues for meeting our goals. I sincerely hope that the Soviet Union will respond with corresponding flexibility.

Finally, high-priority work is continuing on how the mutual and guaranteed build-down concept proposed by several United States senators can be applied in our quest for significant and stabilizing strategic arms reductions.

These actions reflect a bipartisan consensus on arms control, and new flexibility in the negotiations—steps to be viewed seriously by the Soviets and all others who have a stake in world peace. To the leaders of the Soviet Union, I urge that this new opportunity not be lost. To America's friends and allies around the world, I say that your steadfast support for the goals of both deterrence and arms control is essential in the future. To Congress and to the American people, I say let us continue to work together in a bipartisan spirit so that these days will be spoken of in the future as the time when America turned a corner.

Let us put our differences behind us. Let us demonstrate measured flexibility in our approach, while remaining strong in our determination to reach our objectives of arms reductions, stability, and security. Let us be leaders in the cause of peace.

[Editorial from the Washington Post,
June 9, 1983]

TWO NEGOTIATIONS

Any American president dealing with the Russians must conduct two sets of negotiations simultaneously. This is the reality, sometimes the curse, of diplomacy in a democratic society. The bargaining that must go first, since otherwise there is no foundation for the second, is with his own citizens and allies. The second is with the Kremlin. Yesterday President Reagan went a long way toward completing that vital first set of negotiations. He presented the outlines of the altered proposals on limiting intercontinental missiles that his negotiators have carried back to the START table in Geneva.

"When I established the Scowcroft Commission," Mr. Reagan said, "I could not then foresee the impact that this outstanding panel would have." He was referring to the bipartisan presidential group whose balanced recommendations on arms and arms control, as filtered through an attentive Congress, have now become administration policy. For these recommendations, which have provided Mr. Reagan the politician's dream gift of a second chance, too little credit has been given to Brent Scowcroft

and his colleagues. They did a terrific job. You could say, of course, that it is easier to give good advice than to take it. Mr. Reagan has taken it, where a more prideful man might have hesitated to make the implicit confession of earlier error.

The upshot is that Mr. Reagan now has a negotiating position that has been tested and improved in the American political fires. It is an advantage that will not help him so much in the ratifying stage, where he did not stand to need help anyway if he got that far, as in the negotiating stage, where he needs a great deal of help. The support that his new position and, perhaps even more, his newly projected flexibility will bring him should make it harder for the Soviets to go over his head to the American public, as they like to do.

Two broad questions still need to be asked about Mr. Reagan's newly enunciated START position. Would an agreement based on it make the United States more secure? By and large the people knowledgeable about defense believe it would. Is it negotiable? That is, can it be matched to the Soviet Union's own definition of its self-interest? We think it can be. Our distinct impression is that Mr. Reagan is becoming, by political necessity if not by personal choice, a believer in arms control as one essential element in strengthening American security. Gone from his latest statement is his frequent past intimation that arms control was unnecessary, perhaps even a peril. His appeal to the Soviets can be usefully underlined: "To the leaders of the Soviet Union, I urge that this new opportunity not be lost." ●

COMPREHENSIVE DRUG PENALTY ACT OF 1983

(Mr. HUGHES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Comprehensive Drug Penalty Act of 1983. This bill is the result of a thorough examination by the Subcommittee on Crime of the problems confronted by Federal law enforcement agencies in their attempts to take the profits out of drug dealing and is a substantial reform of penalties and forfeiture procedures. The net result of the subcommittee's inquiries reemphasized the fact that the single most important crime problem confronting this country is the vast increase in drug trafficking in recent years. The subcommittee heard testimony that we are now faced with a situation where drug dealers have been able to accumulate huge fortunes as a result of their illegal activities, and the sad truth is that the financial penalties for drug dealing are frequently only seen by dealers as a cost of doing business. Under current law the maximum fine for many serious drug offenses is only \$25,000. Moreover, the Government's ability to obtain civil or criminal forfeiture of the profits or proceeds of drug dealing has been hampered by a number of deficiencies.

An overview of the problems of any economic attack on the illegal drug business presented by Government of

ficials at these hearings produced a clear consensus about the need for change. What was less clear was the path to achieve that reform. Most observers agreed that prosecutors face three major problems: Ambiguous statutes, problems in tracing the proceeds of drug trafficking, and difficulties in proof. The solutions to these dilemmas were numerous and pursuit of them created a divergence of views. For example, while it may be desirable to expand the authority of the Government to seize property involving drug trafficking, one must also be careful to protect the rights of innocent third parties.

However, the Subcommittee on Crime and the full Committee on the Judiciary were able to fashion H.R. 7140 to deal with these complex issues in the 97th Congress in a truly bipartisan fashion. H.R. 7140 was then placed on the suspension calendar and was passed by the House of Representatives without dissent on September 28, 1982. A compromise version of this bill along with other bills (H.R. 3963, the anticrime package) passed the House and Senate late in the lameduck session of the 97th Congress by the margin of 271 to 72 in the House and unanimously in the Senate. Unfortunately, the President, primarily on an issue unrelated to this bill—and against the advice of a bipartisan delegation from Congress, decided to pocket veto the anticrime package.

As a result of the President's ill-advised veto, we are forced to process this much needed legislation again in the 98th Congress.

The following are the essential elements of the new Comprehensive Drug Penalties Act of 1983 which is essentially the same as H.R. 7140 in the 97th Congress:

First, the bill substantially increases maximum permissible criminal fines in drug cases and establishes a new alternative fine concept under which drug offenders can be fined up to twice their gross profits or proceeds where the alternative fine would be greater than that specified in the crime itself. The new maximum fine limits were developed in large part by the Judiciary Committee during the consideration of the Criminal Code revision in the 96th Congress. The alternative fine concept was recommended in the final report of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws—the Brown Commission.

Second, it amends the present civil forfeiture law (21 U.S.C. 881) to permit the civil forfeiture of land and building used, or intended to be used, for holding of storage of controlled substances when such use constitutes a felony. Current law is unclear as to whether warehouses or other buildings can be forfeited.

Third, the bill changes certain venue authority to allow the Justice Department to bring civil forfeiture actions in the district where the defendant is found or where the criminal prosecution is brought.

Fourth, it sets aside up to \$10 million per year in fiscal year 1984 and fiscal year 1985 from forfeiture dispositions into a revolving fund to be used for drug law enforcement purposes.

Fifth, the bill provides, for the first time, criminal forfeiture provisions for all felony drug cases.

Sixth, it outlines authority for courts to restrain the transfer of property which might be subject to forfeiture and to order the seizure of such property in order to insure its availability for a forfeiture proceeding. Remission and mitigation provisions are also provided in order to protect the interests of innocent property owners.

It also details procedures for allowing temporary restraining orders in ex parte hearings under extraordinary circumstances.

Seventh, the bill creates a permissive presumption in criminal forfeiture cases that all property acquired by drug offenders during the period of the violations or shortly thereafter is subject to forfeiture if no other likely source for such property exists. These provisions follow closely the U.S. Supreme Court opinion in *Ulster County Court, N.Y. v. Allen*, 442 U.S. 140 (1979).

In this fashion we have attempted to balance the strong societal interest in eradicating trafficking in illegal drugs with the constitutional rights of our citizens. In the Comprehensive Drug Penalty Act of 1983, we are satisfied that a proper balance has been struck, and look forward to hearing the assessments of interested parties on this bill. Anyone with views on this legislation should communicate directly with the Subcommittee on Crime, Committee on the Judiciary, 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 or telephone (202) 225-1695. A hearing on this subject is scheduled for June 23, 1983. Anyone wishing to testify should contact the subcommittee.●

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF EQUAL PAY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Equal Pay Act. I appreciate my colleague from New York taking this opportunity to remind us of the continued need for concern about the question of economic equity. Passage of this act in 1963 spurred the important task of breaking down the system of wage discrimination on the

basis of sex. Numerous cases in which women and men performed equal work but were receiving unequal pay have been rectified by the courts in the past 20 years.

What we face today is the difficult step beyond the question of equal pay for equal work. At issue is the way in which we determine the value of and compensation for any given job. The Equal Pay Act mandates that a male salesperson, for example, may not be paid more than a female salesperson, but we have not yet confronted the inequality which results from sex segregation in different jobs. Employment in America occurs along a two-tracked job structure. While men are trained and hired as managers, engineers, professors, chemists, electricians, and plumbers, the clerical and lower echelon service professions are primarily relegated to women. In 1979, women made up 80 percent of clerical workers, a category including secretaries, bank tellers, billing clerks, and cashiers. They make up two-thirds of school teachers and 91 percent of registered nurses, dietitians, and therapists.

In these jobs, pay averages \$4,000, a year less than in male-dominated jobs. We send a message daily to employees across the United States that work as a teacher, a secretary, or a nurse is far less valuable than the work of an accountant, an electrician, or a construction worker. For example, despite the fact that a nurse's work is vital to the life of patients in a hospital, salaries of experienced staff nurses average less than \$17,000 a year. One study showed that a pharmacist with similar skill, effort, and responsibility may be making \$10,000 more than a comparably experienced nurse.

Despite the fact that a teacher may hold an advanced degree, the starting salary for a teacher with a master's degree in 1981-82 was \$14,000—in contrast to an engineer with a comparable degree starting at \$25,000. The average salary for a teacher is \$19,000, with higher salaries in secondary schools than in the elementary schools which have 98 percent female teachers. The low pay, of course, makes it difficult to integrate men into the elementary schools, as men gravitate toward the higher-paying administrative positions.

A serious problem resulting in part from this indirect discrimination is that working women face increasing poverty. Three-fifths of working women earn less than \$10,000 a year. Many of these poorly paid women are single parents struggling to raise families. Women can no longer afford to be treated as secondary or supplementary earners because their incomes are essential to their families' livelihoods.

What is required now is a reconsideration of the way in which the value of work is assessed. We must begin by

pushing for vigorous enforcement of the Equal Pay Act and of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bans sex discrimination in compensation. The courts have held that these acts provide a basis for the requirement of equal pay for comparable work by women and men. If the work of individuals in service and clerical professions is to be granted its full value, we must also direct our efforts to increasing social recognition of the existence of inequities in wages resulting from deeply rooted sexual stereotyping. A number of States, including my own State of Michigan, have initiated job evaluation research to examine wage depression in female-dominated jobs. Ending pay inequity will require an acknowledgement that the work traditionally done by women secretaries, bank tellers, nurses, receptionists, waitresses, telephone operators, and teachers is vital to the U.S. culture and economy. On the anniversary of this landmark legislation, let us affirm our commitment to economic equity by giving workers in these professions the salaries they have earned.●

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM AMENDMENTS OF 1983

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ANTHONY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern among us who serve in the U.S. Congress and the public about the escalating costs of campaigning and the influence and impact of political action committees in election contests.

I share that concern. That is why I joined with my colleague, Representative MIKE SYNAR of Oklahoma, in introducing the Campaign Finance Reform Amendments of 1983.

This legislation is designed to reduce the influence of political action committees and to increase the influence of individuals in campaign financing.

Let me say that I do not believe that political action committees are evil or corrupt. I do not believe their intent is to corrupt politicians or the political process.

I am told that I received more PAC contributions than any candidate for Congress in my home State of Arkansas last year. Many of those PAC's that contributed to my campaign were formed by people who live and work in the State of Arkansas. They formed committees, studied voting records, and gave to the candidate who had best represented them and their interests in the past. I was proud to receive their support.

But we must also face the fact of the tremendous growth in political action committees and the amount of money they give to political campaigns, as

well as the escalating cost of campaigns. In 1974, PAC's gave \$12.5 million to House and Senate candidates. Six years later, the amount of money PAC's gave to congressional campaigns had increased by almost five times to \$55 million. By 1982, PAC contributions increased to \$85.7 million. In 1974, there were only 608 PAC's. By 1982, that number had grown to 3,371.

There are many who believe that PAC's buy access and influence by their contributions. There are some who believe PAC's are only rewarding persons of like views for their past stands. Whatever the intent of PAC giving, in the public's mind, those contributions are undermining public credibility in our election process. And I believe that it is having a detrimental effect on us, as elected representatives, because we are having to spend more and more time on fundraising to finance the astronomical costs of our campaigns.

The public does see a need for reform and change in our method of financing campaigns. In a Louis Harris and Associates, Inc., survey last November, the public endorsed, by 84-14 percent, the view that those who contribute large sums of money have too much influence over government. Sixty-two percent, in the same poll, felt that excessive campaign spending in national elections is a very serious problem.

But while the public sees a need for reform, about the only overwhelming consensus on the issue of reform is opposition to public financing of congressional campaigns. A February 1983 poll by Civic Service, Inc., showed the public disapproving of public financing of congressional campaigns by a 56-24 percent margin.

From my own experience, and the experience of my colleagues with whom I have talked, we, too, see a need for a change. We see a need to limit the cost of campaigns. I do believe that escalating campaign costs can be attributed, in no small part, to the growth of PAC's and the money PAC's contribute to political campaigns.

I believe that my colleagues agree with me that we must limit in some way the growth and growing influence of political action committees on the election process—not because they are inherently bad, but because they are supplanting the traditional role and the responsibility of the individual and of political parties in our election process.

We need to restore the balance between the concerns of the individual and the concerns of special interest. We need to spend less time raising money among those who can afford to give and more time with those who cannot afford to give to congressional campaigns.

I believe that by imposing a ceiling on the amount of PAC contributions and increasing the amount individuals can give, we will begin to restore the balance. Our bill increases the amount individuals can contribute from \$1,000 to \$2,500. Basically, it limits House candidates to receiving \$75,000 and Senate candidates to receiving between \$75,000 and \$500,000 from PAC's.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHENEY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MacKAY (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), after 2:30 p.m. today, on account of necessary business.

Mr. KOLTER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for this week, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. MOLINARI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CORCORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAMPBELL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SNYDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DYSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUDDS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. AuCOIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. COYNE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEAL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, on House Resolution 207 in the House today.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.

Mr. MOLINARI.

Mr. FIELDS in two instances.

Mr. FISH.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in five instances.

Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.
Mr. MORRISON of Washington.
Mr. MICHEL.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. GILMAN in three instances.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
Mr. O'BRIEN.

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

Mr. SABO.

Mr. LELAND.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. LEHMAN of California.

Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. AuCOIN.

Mr. UDALL in two instances.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. GEPHARDT in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. RATCHFORD.

Mr. McDONALD.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. GARCIA.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.

Ms. MIKULSKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 13, 1983, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1333. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report issued by his office entitled, "Revenue Report for April 1983," pursuant to section 455 of Public Law 93-198; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1334. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the annual report of the National Technical Institute for the Deaf for fiscal year 1982, pursuant to section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 89-36; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1335. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy, transmitting the Commission's eighth report, entitled "The Work Revolution," pursuant to section 505 of Public Law 93-203, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1336. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on energy

conservation and solar energy in Federal buildings and on the coordination of Federal energy conservation factors and data pursuant to section 550 of Public Law 95-619 and section 597 of Public Law 96-294; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1337. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on revised records systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(0); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1338. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting notice of a proposed new records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(0); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1339. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting notice of a proposed altered system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(0); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1340. A letter from the Director, NAF Financial Management, Office of the Adjutant General, Department of the Army, transmitting the annual report for the U.S. Army nonappropriated fund (NAF) employee retirement plan for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, pursuant to Public Law 95-595; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1341. A letter from the Director, Federal Prison System, Department of Justice, transmitting the 1982 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1342. A letter from the Executive Office of the President (Office of Management and Budget), transmitting notice of proposed draft legislation to simplify the authorizations for reduced-rate postage supported through appropriated funds, to enable the extent of public support for eligible mailings to be more visible and more easily understood by the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. Supplemental report on H.R. 2867 (Rept. No. 98-198, Pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1875. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to modify the dairy price support program for the 1983 through 1985 fiscal years, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 98-237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HEFNER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3263. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 98-238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 3151. A bill to name the U.S. Post Office Building to be constructed in Fort Worth, Tex., as the

"Jack D. Watson Post Office Building" (Rept. No. 98-239). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

[Omitted from the Record of June 8, 1983]

By Mr. HANCE (for himself, Mr. LOEF-FLER, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. FROST, Mr. VANDERGRIF, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 3253. A bill to repeal the crude oil windfall profit tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

[Introduced June 9, 1983]

By Mr. HEFNER:
H.R. 3263. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1984, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BIAGGI:
H.R. 3264. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require commercial passenger-carrying aircraft to be equipped with smoke detectors and automatic fire extinguishers in all aircraft lavatories and galley areas; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. COELHO:
H.R. 3265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that losses attributable to disasters determined to warrant assistance under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 shall be allowable as a deduction without regard to whether they exceed 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORCORAN:
H.R. 3266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain married individuals shall be eligible for the deduction for retirement savings on the basis of earned income of their spouses and to increase in three steps the limit on deductions for retirement savings from \$2,000 to \$5,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FIELDS:
H.R. 3267. A bill relating to the effective date of the provision in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 which permits elections under section 2032A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to be made on late estate tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:
H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the principal campaign committee of a candidate for State or local office will be subject to tax at the graduated corporate tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:
H.R. 3269. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for the carryover of unobligated appropriated amounts from any fiscal year to the succeeding fiscal year and a corresponding reduction in appropriations

for such succeeding fiscal year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PASHAYAN:
H.R. 3270. A bill to establish a seasonal agricultural foreign worker program; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Agriculture.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. REID, Mr. SABO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. CARR):

H.R. 3271. A bill to broaden the base of the individual and corporate income taxes, to significantly reduce tax rates, to flatten out the rate schedules of the individual income tax, and to simplify the tax laws by eliminating most credits, deductions, and exclusions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3272. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act to improve forfeiture provisions and strengthen penalties for controlled substances offenses, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McNULTY:
H.R. 3273. A bill to establish a commission to investigate the relocation of governmental functions outside the immediate vicinity of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OBEY:
H.R. 3274. A bill to increase the penalties for violations of the Taft-Hartley Act, to prohibit persons, upon their convictions of certain crimes, from holding offices in or certain positions related to labor organizations and employee benefit plans, and to clarify certain responsibilities of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:
H.R. 3275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that disability income shall not be subject to income tax withholding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABO:
H.R. 3276. A bill to provide for certification and require the offering of qualified health plans, to provide Federal assistance to States to establish a program of assistance for low-income persons to purchase comprehensive health insurance and a program for coverage of catastrophic health care expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:
H.R. 3277. A bill to improve the regulation of civilian nuclear powerplants and to provide economic incentives for their safe operation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FORSYTHE, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 3278. A bill to provide a comprehensive system of liability and compensation for oilspill damage and removal costs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 3279. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding sentencing for capital offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

188. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the conveyance of additional land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 81: Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.R. 82: Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.R. 408: Mr. McCOLLUM and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 656: Mr. GRAY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. FERRARO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 800: Mr. FOLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 953: Mr. NEAL, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 954: Mr. HORTON and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1020: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. HALL of Indiana, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. COYNE, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1183: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1199: Mr. ST GERMAIN and Mr. BREAU.

H.R. 1676: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McHUGH, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1691: Mr. CRAIG and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1823: Mr. SIMON.

H.R. 1824: Mr. LEHMAN of California and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 1870: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. BRITT, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. COATS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DYSON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MICA, Mr. MOORE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 1885: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 2014: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LELAND, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2053: Mr. LUJAN and Mr. PICKLE.

H.R. 2088: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2099: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. PATTERSON.

H.R. 2100: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. PATTERSON.

H.R. 2118: Mr. MARRIOTT and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 2124: Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE, and Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 2154: Mr. HOYER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. SAVAGE.

H.R. 2186: Mr. WEAVER and Mr. BOSCO.

H.R. 2193: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 2323: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2382: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 2468: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 2498: Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana.

H.R. 2746: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. CORRADA and Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 2819: Mr. STARK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, Mr. WISE, Mr. CARR, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. D'AMOURS, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 2847: Mr. ALBOSTA.

H.R. 2871: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DREIER of California, and Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 2883: Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. BREAU, and Mr. PEPPER.

H.R. 2911: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE.

H.R. 3028: Mr. KEMP, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ROE, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEISS, Mr. YATES, Mr. FISH, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 3050: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 3184: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. WINN.

H.R. 3224: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. WALGREN.

H.J. Res. 153: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 201: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 227: Mr. REID, Mr. COELHO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CHAPPEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr.

FLIPPO, Mr. BETHUNE, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. WON PAT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LENT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HILER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BRITT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WOLFE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. GRAY.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. SKELTON and Mr. CARR.
H.J. Res. 258: Mr. MINETA, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. WON PAT.

H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. HARTNETT.

H. Res. 39: Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

H. Res. 182: Mrs. BOXER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. LELAND.

H. Res. 191: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

118. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Cyprus, relative to the maintenance of peace; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1590

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

—On page 14, after line 2, insert the following new section:

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

Sec. 8. (a) Effective on October 1, 1983, section 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c, note) is amended by striking out, in subsection (a), "amount appropriated for the provision of commodities to State agencies." and inserting in lieu thereof "sum of (1) the total amount appropriated for the commodity supplemental food program, and (2) the value of bonus commodities, as defined by the Secretary, which are included in food packages distributed to program participants."

(b) The provisions of this section shall become effective on October 1, 1983.