

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 20, 1985

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

Almighty God, for the beauty of this day we give You thanks; for the friends of this day may we show appreciation; for the opportunities of this day may we have strength; for any dangers of this day may we have courage; and for all the good gifts of this day, let us rejoice. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that today when the Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by the Prime Minister of Great Britain only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor and the cooperation of all the Members is requested.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 31, 1985, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE 99TH CONGRESS HELD PURSUANT TO THE ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF JANUARY 31, 1985, TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE MARGARET THATCHER, PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Malloy, announced the Vice

President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to conduct the Prime Minister of Great Britain into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT];

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY];

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR];

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL];

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT];

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP]; and

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the Prime Minister of Great Britain into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON];

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP];

The Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM];

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD];

The Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON];

The Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON]; and

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House

of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m., the Doorkeeper announced the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

The Prime Minister of Great Britain, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege, and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure, to present to you the Right Honorable Margaret Thatcher, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Prime Minister MARGARET THATCHER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of Congress, on this, one of the most moving occasions of my life, my first words must be to say thank you for granting me this rare privilege of addressing a joint meeting of the United States Congress.

My thoughts turn to three earlier occasions when a British Prime Minister—Winston Churchill—has been honored by a call to address both Houses.

Among his many remarkable gifts, Winston held a special advantage here. Through his American mother he had ties of blood with you. Alas for me, these are not matters we can readily arrange for ourselves. Those three occasions deserve to be recalled because they serve as lamps along a dark road which our people trod together, and they remind us what an extraordinary period of history the world has passed through between that time and ours. And they tell us what later generations in both our countries sometimes find hard to grasp—why past associations bind us so closely.

Winston Churchill's vision of a union of mind and purpose between

□ 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 English speaking peoples was to form the mainspring of the West.

No one of my generation can forget that America has been the principal architect of a peace in Europe which has lasted 40 years. Given this shield of the United States, we have been granted the opportunities to build a concept of Europe beyond the dreams of our fathers: A Europe which seemed unattainable amid the mud and slaughter of the First World War and the suffering and sacrifice of the second.

When, in the spring of 1945, the guns fell silent, General Eisenhower called our soldiers to a service of thanksgiving. In the order of service was the famous prayer of Sir Francis Drake: "O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavor in great matter, grant us to know that it is not the beginning but the continuing of the same, until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory."

On this day, close to the 40th anniversary of that service, and of peace in Europe, one of the longest periods without war in all our history, I should like to recall those words and acknowledge how faithfully America has fulfilled them.

For our deliverance from what might have befallen us, I would not have us leave our gratitude to the tributes of history. The debt the free peoples of Europe owe to this Nation generous with its bounty, willing to share its strength, seeking to protect the weak, is uncalculable. We thank and salute you.

Of course, in the years which separate us from the time when Winston Churchill last spoke to Congress, there have been disappointments, as well as hopes fulfilled, the continued troubles in the Middle East, famine and oppression in Africa, genocide in South East Asia, the brutal occupation of Afghanistan, the undiminished agony of tortured Poland, and above all the continued and continuing division of the European Continent.

From these shores it may seem to some of you that by comparison with the risks and sacrifices which America has borne through four decades, and the courage with which you have shouldered unwanted burdens, Europe has not fully matched your expectations.

Bear with me if I dwell for a moment on the Europe to which we now belong. It is not the Europe of ancient Rome, of Charlemagne, of Bismarck. We who are alive today have passed through perhaps the greatest transformation of human affairs on the continent of Europe since the fall of Rome.

In but a short chapter of its long history, Europe lost the position which it had occupied for 2,000 years. And it is your history as much as ours.

For five centuries, that small continent had extended its authority over islands and continents the world over, for the first 40 years of this century there were seven great powers—the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Japan, and Italy.

Of those seven, two now tower over the rest—the United States and the Soviet Union.

To that swift and historic change Europe—a Europe of many different histories, of many different nations—has had to find a response.

It has not been an easy passage to blend this conflux of nationalism, patriotism, sovereignty into a European community.

Yet I think that our children and grandchildren may see this period, these birth pangs of a new Europe, more clearly than we do now. They will see it as a visionary chapter in the creation of a Europe able to share the load alongside you.

Do not doubt the firmness of our resolve in this march toward this goal.

But don't underestimate what we already do.

Today, out of the forces of the alliance in Europe, 95 percent of the divisions, 85 percent of the tanks, 80 percent of the combat aircraft and 70 percent of the fighting ships are provided, manned, and paid for by the European allies, and Europe has more than 3 million men under arms and more still in reserve. We have to.

We are right in the front line. The frontier of freedom cuts across our continent. Members of Congress, the defense of that frontier is as vital to you as it is to us.

It is fashionable for some commentators to speak of the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, as though they were somehow of equal worth and equal significance.

Mr. Speaker, that is a travesty of the truth.

The Soviet Union has never concealed its real aim. In the words of Mr. Brezhnev: "The total triumph of socialism all over the world is inevitable, for this triumph . . . We shall struggle with no lack of effort."

Indeed, there has been no lack of effort.

Contrast this with the record of the West. We do not aim at domination, at hegemony in any part of the world. Even against those who oppose and who would destroy our ideas. We plot no aggression.

Of course, we are ready to fight the battle of ideas with all the vigor at our command. But we do not try to impose our system on others. We do not believe that force should be the final arbiter in human affairs. We threaten no one. Indeed, the alliance has given a solemn assurance to the world: "None of our weapons will be used except in response to attack."

In talking to the Soviet Union, we find great difficulty in getting this message across. They judge us by their ambitions. They cannot conceive of a powerful nation not using its power for expansion or subversion.

And yet they should remember that when, after the last war, the United States had a monopoly of nuclear weapons, she never once exploited her superiority. No country ever used such great power more responsibly or with such restraint.

I wonder what would have befallen us in Western Europe and Great Britain if that monopoly had been in Soviet hands.

Mr. Speaker, wars are not caused by the buildup of weapons.

They are caused when an aggressor believes he can achieve his objectives at an acceptable price.

The war of 1939 was not caused by an arms race. It sprang from a tyrant's belief that other countries lacked the means and the will to resist him.

Remember Bismarck's phrase: "Do I want war? Of course not, I want victory."

Our task is to see that potential aggressors from whatever quarter understand plainly that the capacity and the resolve of the West would deny them victory in war: and that the price they would pay would be intolerable.

That is the basis of deterrence and it is the same whatever the nature of the weapons. For let us never forget the horrors of conventional wars and the hideous sacrifice of those who have suffered in them. Our task is not only to prevent nuclear war, but to prevent conventional war as well.

No one understood the importance of deterrence more clearly than Winston Churchill when in his last speech to you he said: "Be careful above all things not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure, and more than sure, that other means of preserving peace are in your hands." Thirty-three years on, those weapons are still keeping the peace.

But since then, technology has moved on, and if we are to maintain deterrence, as we must, it is essential that our research and capacity do not fall behind the work being done by the Soviet Union.

That is why I firmly support President Reagan's decision to pursue research into defense against ballistic nuclear missiles—the strategic defense initiative.

Indeed, I hope that our own scientists will share in this research.

The United States and the Soviet Union are both signatories to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a treaty without any terminal date. Nothing in that treaty precludes research, but should that research on either side lead to the possible deployment of new defense systems, that would be a

matter for negotiation under the treaty.

But, Mr. Speaker, despite our differences with the Soviet Union, we have to talk with them. For we have one overriding interest in common: That never again should there be a conflict between our peoples. We hope, too, that we can achieve security with far fewer weapons than we have today and at lower cost. And thanks to the skillful diplomacy of Secretary Shultz, negotiations on arms control open in Geneva on the 12th of March. They will be of immense importance to millions. They will be intricate, complex and demanding. And we should not expect too much too soon.

We must recognize that we shall face a Soviet political offensive designed to sow differences among us, calculated to create infirmity of purpose, to impair resolve—and even to arouse fear in the hearts of our people.

Hope is such a precious commodity in the world today that some are tempted to buy it at too high a price. We shall have to resist the muddled arguments of those who have been induced to believe that Russia's intentions are benign and that ours are suspect, or who would have us simply give up our defenses in the hope that where we led others would follow.

As we learned cruelly in the 1930's, from good intentions can come tragic results.

Let us be under no illusions: It is our strength and not their goodwill that has brought the Soviet Union to the negotiating table in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, we know that our alliance, if it holds firm, cannot be defeated. But it could be outflanked. It is among the unfree and the underfed that subversion takes root.

As Ethiopia demonstrated, those people get precious little help from the Soviet Union and its allies. The weapons which they pour in bring neither help nor hope to the hungry.

It is the West which heard their cries. It is the West which responded massively to the heart-rending starvation in Africa. It is the West which has made a unique contribution to the uplifting of hundreds of millions of people from poverty, illiteracy and disease.

But the problems of the Third World are not only those of famine. They face also a mounting burden of debt, falling prices for primary products, protectionism by the industrialized countries.

Some of the remedies are in the hands of the developing countries themselves. They can open their markets to productive investment. They can pursue responsible policies of economic adjustment. We should respect the courage and resolve with which so many of them have tackled their spe-

cial problems. But we also have a duty to help.

How can we help? First, and most important, by keeping our markets open to them. Protectionism is a danger to all our trading partnerships. And for many countries trade is even more important than aid. And so we in Britain support President Reagan's call for a new GATT round.

The current strength of the dollar, which is causing so much difficulty for some of your industries, creates obvious pressures for "special cases," for new trade barriers to a free market. I am certain that your administration is right to resist such pressures.

To give in to them would betray the millions in the developing world, to say nothing of the strains on your other trading partners. The developing countries need our markets, as we need theirs.

And we cannot preach economic adjustment to them, and refuse to practice it at home.

And, second, we must remember that the way in which we in the developed countries manage our economies determines whether the world's financial framework is stable; it determines the level of interest rates; it determines the amount of capital available for sound investment the world over; and it determines whether or not the poor countries can service their past loans, let alone compete for new ones.

Those are the reasons why we support so strongly your efforts to reduce the budget deficit. No other country in the world can be immune from its effects. Such is the influence of the American economy on us all.

We in Europe have watched with admiration the burgeoning of this mighty American economy. There is a new mood in the United States. A visitor feels it at once. The resurgence of your self-confidence and your national pride is almost tangible. Now the Sun is rising in the West.

For many years our vitality in Britain was blunted by excessive reliance on the State. Our industries were nationalized, controlled and subsidized in a way that yours never were. We're having to recover the spirit of enterprise which you never lost.

Many of the policies you are following are the policies we are following.

You have brought inflation down. So have we.

You have declared war on regulations and controls. So have we. Our civil service is now smaller than at any time since the war. And controls on pay, prices, dividends, foreign exchange all are gone.

You have encouraged small business, so often the source of tomorrow's jobs. So have we.

But above all, we are carrying out the largest program of denationalization in our history. Just a few years ago in Britain, privatization was

thought to be a pipe dream. Now it is a reality, and a popular one.

Our latest success was the sale of British Telecommunications. It was the largest share issue ever to be brought to the market on either side of the Atlantic. Some 2 million people bought shares.

Members of Congress, that is what capitalism is: A system which brings wealth to the many, and not just to the few.

The United Kingdom economy is in its fourth year of recovery, slower than yours but positive recovery.

We have not yet shared your success in bringing down unemployment, although we are creating many new jobs.

But output, investment and standard of living are all at record levels and profits are well up.

And the pound, it is too low. But whatever the proper international level of sterling, it is a marvelous time for Americans not only to visit Britain, but to invest with us.

And many are. America is by far the largest direct investor in Britain and I am delighted to say that Britain is the largest direct investor in the United States.

The British economy has an underlying strength. Any, like you, we use our strength and resolve to carry out our duties to our allies and to the wider world.

We were the first country to station cruise missiles on our territory. Britain led the rest.

In proportion to our population we station the same number of troops as you in Germany.

In Central America we keep troops stationed in Belize at the Government's request. That is our contribution to sustaining democracy in a part of the world so vital to the United States.

We have troops in Cyprus and in the south Atlantic and, at your request, a small force in the Sinai, and British servicemen are now on loan to some 30 foreign countries. We were alongside you in Beirut. We work with you in the Atlantic and in the Indian Ocean. Our navy is on duty across the world.

Mr. Speaker, Britain meets her responsibilities in the defense of freedom throughout the world and she will go on doing so.

But, Members of Congress, closer to home there is a threat to freedom both savage and insidious. Both our countries have suffered at the hands of terrorists. We have both lost some of our best young lives. And I have lost some close and dear friends.

Free, strong, democratic societies will not be driven by gunmen to abandon freedom or democracy.

The problems of the Middle East will not be solved by the coldblooded murder of American servicemen in

Lebanon, nor by the murder of American civilians on a hijacked aircraft. Nor will the problems of Northern Ireland be solved by the assassin's gun or bomb.

Garret Fitzgerald and I and our respective governments are united in condemning terrorism.

We recognize the differing traditions and identities of the two parts of the community of Northern Ireland, the nationalist and the unionist. We seek a political way forward acceptable to them both which respects them both.

So long as a majority of the people of Northern Ireland wish to remain part of the United Kingdom, their wishes will be respected. If ever there were to be a majority in favor of change, then I believe that our Parliament would respond accordingly.

For that is the principle of consent, enshrined in your Constitution and an essential part of ours.

There is no disagreement on this principle between the United Kingdom Government and the Government of the Republic of Ireland.

Indeed the four constitutional nationalist parties of Ireland, north and south, who came together to issue the new Ireland forum report, made clear that any new arrangements could only come about by consent, and I welcome, too, their outright condemnation and total rejection of terrorism and all its works.

Be under no illusions about the Provisional IRA. They terrorize their own communities. They are the enemies of democracy, and of freedom, too.

Do not just take my word for it. Ask the Government of the Irish Republic, where it is an offense even to belong to that organization, as indeed it also is in Northern Ireland.

I recognize and appreciate the efforts which have been made by the administration and Congress alike to bring home this message to American citizens who may be misled into making contributions to seemingly innocuous groups. The fact is that money is used to buy the deaths of Irishmen, north and south of the border; and 70 percent of those killed by the IRA are Irishmen. And that money buys the killing and wounding even of American citizens visiting our country.

Garret Fitzgerald—and I salute him for the very brave thing he did yesterday in passing a special law to see that money did not get to the IRA—Garret Fitzgerald and I will continue to consult together in the quest for stability and peace in Northern Ireland. And we hope we will have your continued support for our joint efforts to find a way forward.

Distinguished Members of Congress, our two countries have a common heritage as well as a common language. It is no mere figure of speech to say that many of your most enduring tradi-

tions, representative government, habeas corpus, trial by jury, a system of constitutional checks and balances, stem from our own small islands.

But they are as much your lawful inheritance as ours. You did not borrow these traditions. You took them with you, because they were already your own.

Human progress is not automatic. Civilization has its ebbs and flows. But if we look at the history of the last 500 years, whether in the field of art, science, technology, religious tolerance or in the practice of politics, the conscious inspiration of it all has been the belief and practice of freedom under law, a freedom disciplined by morality, under a law perceived to be just.

I cannot conclude this address without recalling words made immortal by your great President Abraham Lincoln in his second inaugural address, when he looked beyond an age when men fought and strove toward a more peaceful future. "With malice toward none, with charity for all: With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work that we are in * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations."

Members of Congress, may our two kindred Nations go forward together, sharing Lincoln's vision, firm of purpose, strong in faith, warm of heart, as we approach the third millennium of the Christian era.

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 37 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of Great Britain, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FOLEY].

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PRIME MINISTER THATCHER'S ADDRESS

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we had the privilege of listening to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom this morning, and there is no question she is a woman of great substance and held in high regard, and properly so.

It was comforting to note that she felt as strongly about the alliance between the United Kingdom and the United States, but then when she shifted into the question of the Irish problem in Northern Ireland, what was important is that she did raise the issue here, in the Congress of the United States in joint session.

That, we would like to believe, was in response to a letter signed by 40 Members of the House, urging her to do that.

We do, however, take some exceptions to the manner in which she addressed it. She addressed it from her perspective; she talked about terrorism, and we all condemn terrorism universally.

Terrorism comes in many forms. Institutional terrorism which is inflicted by a representative of the United Kingdom that enforced the law in that area.

There is a question of basic rights, civil rights, the discrimination and denial of political opportunity, denial of employment opportunity, denial of proper housing that exists in the six counties of Ulster that the Prime Minister did not address herself to. Hers was a single-dimension approach, serving her own best interests.

What heartened me is the fact that she will continue to speak to the Prime Minister of the Republic. And hopefully that will be productive. We agree that in the end, it will not be terrorism or force of violence that will bring about the solution; it will be a political solution, but there will not be a political solution until all parties to the conflict sit down in good faith, with a determination to resolve an age-old problem.

RESOLUTION ON JAPANESE AUTO IMPORTS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a sense-of-the-Congress resolution calling for the retention of the Japanese auto import agreement.

I do so because I think we need to send a message to the Japanese Government that they need to be much more forthcoming in opening up their markets and turning around the dollar/yen imbalance.

The fact is that despite the talk, all the meetings, and all the promises, we have seen very little in the way of concrete action on the part of the Japanese.

They supposedly agreed to steps last year to stabilize the dollar/yen alignment, but the value of the yen has now reached an all time high.

They continue to drag their feet in a whole host of areas with respect to allowing our products into their markets.

Our trade imbalance with the Japanese has now reached an unbelievable high of \$37 billion.

Twenty billion of that is due to auto imports, even with the import cap. The total imbalance is costing us nearly 1 million jobs according to Commerce Department figures.

The U.S. Trade Commission estimates that removal of the import cap on autos will result in 4 to 5 billion dollars worth of additional Japanese cars flooding our markets.

I don't care what the health of our auto industry is at this time, we as a nation simply cannot afford such an addition to our trade imbalance.

And we cannot afford the job loss that will result.

The resolution I am introducing, identical to one being introduced today in the Senate by Senator DANKFORTH, calls for retention of the voluntary restraint agreement until our exports to Japan are substantially increased and our trade deficit with the Japanese is substantially reduced.

I urge that it be given early committee consideration and be taken up on the House floor as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous-consent request, I include the text of the resolution at this point in the RECORD.

H. CON. RES. 63

Whereas, the United States merchandise trade deficit with Japan reached the unprecedented level of \$37 billion in 1984—accounting for almost one-third of the entire United States deficit with the world;

Whereas, this unprecedented bilateral deficit was accumulated in spite of significant growth in the Japanese economy;

Whereas, the principles of free trade provide for trade flows between nations on the

basis of each nation's comparative advantage;

Whereas, Japan has extensive access to the United States market for products where Japan has comparative advantage;

Whereas, United States exporters lack access to the Japanese market for manufactured goods, forest products, key agricultural commodities and certain services where the United States has comparative advantage;

Whereas, the bilateral trade imbalance is costing the United States hundreds of thousands of jobs every year;

Whereas, the high value of the dollar relative to the yen effectively subsidizes Japanese exports to the United States and taxes United States exports to Japan;

Whereas, despite the voluntary restraint Japanese autos continue to account for approximately 2 million cars imported into the United States market—contributing over \$20 billion to the bilateral trade deficit;

Whereas, years of negotiating with Japan to secure meaningful improvements in market access for competitive United States exports have been largely unsuccessful;

Whereas, many other countries experience comparable difficulty in obtaining access to the Japanese market;

Whereas, an end to the voluntary restraint on autos without a comparable improvement in access for competitive United States exports to the Japanese market will severely exacerbate the bilateral trade deficit;

Whereas, this deficit has the potential of undermining the entire range of bilateral relations between the United States and Japan: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the voluntary restraint on Japanese autos not be ended until United States exports to Japan are substantially increased and the United States trade deficit with Japan is substantially reduced.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, the Chair appoints, on behalf of the Speaker, as members of the House of Representatives Page Board the following Members of the House:

Mr. FAZIO of California; and
Mr. KILDEE of Michigan.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 127 of Public Law 97-377, I appoint the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] as a member of the House of Representatives Page Board.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSED CUTS IN STUDENT FINANCIAL AID SEVERE, UNFAIR, AND SHORTSIGHTED

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed cuts in student financial aid are severe, unfair, and shortsighted. The cuts are too broad. At least 1 million students would be adversely affected by no longer being eligible for assistance.

The proposals are unfair. They strike at the middle class and the poor student, jeopardizing equal opportunity in education by limiting access to private and prestigious universities to only the very rich.

Beyond being unfair, the proposals are shortsighted. Where will tomorrow's scientists, doctors, and lawyers come from? An educated population is a nation's strength. We cannot sacrifice our most valuable asset for tomorrow—our youth.

DON'T INTERFERE WITH THE VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT AGREEMENT WITH THE JAPANESE

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to commend the minority leader for his foresight in introducing the resolution directed to the Japanese, and as to the trade problems as we have grown to know it.

The voluntary restraint agreement should not be interfered with at this time. We have experience with the Japanese. Not only the \$27 billion trade deficit, but there is a serious question as to whether you can depend upon their word.

Some 6 months ago, Ambassador Brock, our special trade negotiator, was sent to Japan, commitments were made, there are going to be some changes; some of our electronics industry was going to be given better consideration and more fair international trade concessions; that did not materialize.

We end up buying everything, all specialty, all highly labor intensive products from the Japanese, and they buy from us oranges and other minor things.

I wish to commend again the minority leader. I am going to be one of the very early cosponsors of his resolution, and I hope and I urge that my colleagues would join in this, what I think is a very proper exercise of the intent of Congress via the resolution area.

□ 1240

DON'T PULL THE PLUG ON FAMILY FARMERS

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

his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times published editorial support for the Reagan administration's elimination of farm programs. The Times, like too many other eastern media, does not understand the severity of the farm problem nor its ultimate impact on urban America.

Today, our colleague LINDSAY THOMAS of Georgia, responded eloquently to the New York Times editorial, explaining the fallacy of the administration's proposal, warning that it would be "an economic time bomb in rural America * * * the beginning of the self-immolation of the agricultural system that is our national treasure and our best hope for a hungry world."

Mr. Speaker, the American family farm is in a state of economic depression. The farmer needs the understanding of his Government and of the press. I commend Mr. THOMAS of Georgia for his excellent article in today's New York Times and recommend his insights into the farm problem for the consideration of our colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 20, 1985]

DON'T PULL THE PLUG ON FAMILY FARMERS To the Editor:

Your Feb. 7 editorial in support of the Administration's proposed dismemberment of Federal farm programs reflects the same tragic misunderstanding of American agriculture that we see today in the White House.

The killing blow that the Administration is preparing for the family farm will not destroy a "19th-century vision of pastoral life" or a handful of marginal farm operators. It will bankrupt many of our most productive farmers and brutalize the economy of our urbanized nation.

The Administration proposes to eliminate \$26 billion from credit and farm subsidies over three years. Many of these programs are sorely in need of reform. But in their place, the Administration proposes nothing.

U.S. agriculture could prosper without such programs if world agriculture operated in a free market. But it does not. Canada is decimating our timber industry with harvests from its government-owned forests. Brazil and Argentina produce the bulk of their commodities on government-owned land with government financing. Australia floods our markets with meat processed under health standards not accepted here. Throughout the world, our farmer competitors are generously cultivated by their national treasuries.

But in America, farm programs are designed primarily to provide stability of supply and price. The support programs we have are truly support programs for the grocery shopper, who enjoys the cheapest food in any developed nation. When Government-induced surpluses and trade policies threw the farmer against the rocks, he continued to subsidize the consumer by using up the equity in his land.

This Administration's best agricultural minds gave us PIK (payment in kind), the most expensive failure of a farm program in recent history. Now, having waited until the credit and price crisis is full blown, it would

step adroitly aside, and presto, we will have more efficient agriculture.

The result of that play will not be the loss of a misty-eyed vision of Americana: it will be the detonation of an economic time bomb in rural America, the collapse of agricultural banks and the eventual soaring of food prices. It will be the beginning of the self-immolation of the agricultural system that is our national treasure and our best hope for a hungry world.

Our best and cheapest course of action is not to pull the plug on the family farmer. Our course must be to modernize our trade and farm policy tools to sustain our agricultural resource through these troubled times.

LINDSAY THOMAS,
Member of Congress, 1st Dist., Ga.,
Washington, February 8, 1985.

STRATEGY MUST BE DEVELOPED TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS ON MEXICAN BORDER

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

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days the United States has launched an intensive search along the Mexican border for U.S. Drug Enforcement Agent Enrique Camarena Salazar, who was abducted on February 7.

This border crackdown has generated a lot of controversy both in Mexico and the United States. In so doing, it has focused new attention on just how open our border is, and why we have so many problems with illegal aliens, terrorists, drugs, and other contraband entering our country through the border with Mexico.

The fact is, it's easy to cross the border between Mexico and the United States. While our Border Patrol and Immigration Service are doing the best they can to police the border, they just don't have the manpower and resources necessary to do the job. How can they be expected to control the influx of illegal aliens and drugs into our country when we have something like one border patrolman for every 200 miles of border with Mexico?

The chaos which is occurring now as a result of the search for Agent Salazar is unacceptable to both America and Mexico. I regret that it has taken this kidnapping incident to show that we are capable of tightening the security along our borders, but that we don't even have a coordinated strategy for doing so.

I hope and pray that Agent Salazar will be rescued safely, and that the rumors of other plots to kidnap U.S. drug enforcement officials prove to be groundless. But we cannot depend on that.

I hope that we have finally learned from this incident that we must develop a strategy and commit the resources now to deal with the terrorism, drug smuggling, illegal aliens and other problems along our border with Mexico.

THE SOCIOECONOMIC WAR IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the House heard Margaret Thatcher proclaim her concern for resolving the problems of violence in Ireland. I hope those concerns would focus on the undeclared socioeconomic war in Northern Ireland, that has made life in Northern Ireland a living hell for the Catholic minority which is constantly reminded of the fact that there are no laws to protect them, no job opportunities, and no hope for the future.

The continued use of the lethal plastic bullet by British Forces occupying that region, and the suspension of basic and individual rights under the Prevention of Terrorism Act, the Emergency Powers Act, and the Diplock court system, continue to frustrate and anger those who work for peace in Northern Ireland. Of all of the human rights violations suffered by the Catholics in Northern Ireland at the hands of this system, however, perhaps none is as pervasive and as detrimental as the discriminatory employment practices exercised toward Catholics in this region.

The right to work is a fundamental right that is not only an economic, but a spiritual necessity. On this note I commend New York City Comptroller, Harrison Goldin for his recent efforts to convince the 13 companies in which the New York City pension funds have investments, to adopt the MacBride principles. If successfully adopted by these American corporations, these equal opportunity-affirmative action principles could have a profound effect on the quality of life for Catholics in Northern Ireland.

THE HATCH ACT

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the Hatch Act was originally intended to protect the average Federal employee from political intimidation by their supervisors. It has, however, recently been perverted under this administration and has become the chief instrument for silencing the private, voluntary, political expression of Federal workers.

Recent examples include the banning of Federal employee participation in nonpartisan voter registration, visible and highly publicized attempts to prosecute Federal employee union leaders who spoke out on behalf of their workers.

We should not, of course, allow Government workers to politic or become

involved in politics to the detriment of the public good. The original intent is sound: Stop harassment, allow the performance of duties without political interference and prevent work in campaigns.

But the Hatch Act is not an excuse to silence dissent. It is not an excuse to prevent the exercise of constitutional liberties. The recent announcement of the prosecution of the leaders of Federal unions is not an act of law enforcement, it is an act of revenge and it has no place in our country.

ON AMERICAN INTERESTS IN IRELAND

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

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed today a great occurrence in the House with the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher addressing the joint session today.

I wish to make a statement that I think is very timely and very important today.

Mr. Speaker, today, February 20, 1985, Ash Wednesday, Congress was addressed by the Prime Minister of England, Margaret Thatcher. Mrs. Thatcher was the first successor of Lord North so honored since Winston Churchill was so honored in 1952.

That such an honor be bestowed upon the head of a government in whose name numerous human rights and civil rights violations are perpetrated upon the Irish people, in those six of the divided Irish province of Ulster's nine counties, known as Northern Ireland, has been protested by numerous Irish-Americans, and Irish-American organizations, and private citizens.

Irish America came to Washington today by the thousands from all over this great country in order that they might bring to the attention of this Congress and of the executive branch their moral outrage over the continuing injustice which is the partition of Ireland and the occupation of part of the Irish national territory by a foreign government and army, contrary to the expressed wishes of the overwhelming majority of the Irish people.

They also came to express their belief today that in all the world only the Government of the United States has the power to focus the attention of the British Government upon the necessity to seek a just and lasting peace for all of Ireland through the recognition of the sovereignty of the Irish nation over the entire island of Ireland, her islands and territorial seas.

In consideration of the concerns of Irish America and of my own concern for peace, justice, and stability in the

North Atlantic community, I welcome this opportunity to begin a dialog with the Westminster Parliament and so shall offer a proposal that this Congress begin by responding to Mrs. Thatcher's remarks with the serious consideration of American interests in Ireland.

I have drafted my position in this grave matter in a paper entitled "On American Interests in Ireland," which I shall offer in this RECORD.

I am thankful for the opportunity to address the House on this most timely and important matter to all Americans.

ON AMERICAN INTERESTS IN IRELAND

To many Americans, the tragedy that is in "Northern Ireland" today is little more than an internal British squabble, or at most, a bilateral concern between Dublin and London. In any case, most Americans feel that the "Irish Question" is of no practical concern to the United States. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The United States has a definite interest in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in Ireland and in the corollary reconciliation of the "British" and Irish peoples. American interests go beyond the fact that we have deep and abiding ties of blood and affection with all parties to the tragic conflict that is in Ireland today. Our interest also lies in the establishment of political, economic and military/naval stability in a part of the world which lies immediately beside the jugular vein of commerce and communication between North America and most of the rest of the North Atlantic community.

The continuing conflict in those six of the divided Irish province of Ulster's nine counties known as "Northern Ireland" costs the United Kingdom in blood, treasure, and reputation. It costs the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in terms of the absence of Ireland (with her proven military manpower and her strategically-located naval and air bases) and its costs in downgraded British participation in the face of the Soviet threat. Ultimately, though indirectly, it is the American soldier, sailor, airman, Marine and taxpayer who must take up the slack in the maintenance of the defense of the West. (This last point was reinforced by the recent South Atlantic conflict with Argentina).

Since the 1981 Hunger Strikes, interest in the "troubles" in Ireland has increased around the world, especially in the United States; New York City, for example, witnesses months and months of the largest sustained Irish demonstrations and general press and media interest since the early 1920's. It is a matter of public scandal for the entire Western World that Ireland today is witness to political concentration camps. Whether viewed as a question of human rights or of political/military insurgency, and current conflict in the "North" of Ireland is a blot upon the reputation of the United Kingdom and a chink in both the moral and the physical armor of the West.

The American dimension to the centuries-old Anglo-Irish conflict has existed since long before the independence of the United States. There is a significant body of American opinion which believes not only in the moral rectitude of a truly independent Irish Ireland, "not Free merely, but Gaelic as well, not Gaelic merely, but Free as well,"

but which feels a moral imperative to work through the American political system to seek to hasten the English withdrawal and the reunification of Ireland which are the sine qua non of a just and lasting peace for all of Ireland. It is most significant that the Primate of All Ireland and the previous Taoiseach (Irish Prime Minister) alike have recognized both the legitimacy and the utility of the American dimension.

Sharing the bright dream of the men and women of Easter Week 1916, many Americans have pledged themselves "To aid and advance by all legitimate means the aspirations and endeavors of the Irish people for complete and absolute independence."

Ireland is chronically destabilized by the "British" presence. The on-going conflict in north-east Ireland is not only a growing concern to Irish America, but also a potential threat to the security and stability of the North Atlantic community. Ireland lies astride the sealanes through which Europe and, yes, Great Britain must be reinforced and resupplied in the event of a crisis. We have no less an authority for this strategic judgement than the former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee, Admiral of the Fleet Sir Peter Hill-Norton (No soft Options: The Politico-Military Realities of NATO, 1978).

Nothing that has been tried since 1920 has alleviated the sufferings of the Irish people nor the political instability of Ireland. Partition was the principal cause of Irish "official" neutrality during the Second World War, and Partition has the same effect today. Ireland must reachieve national unity with sufficient alacrity to preclude meddling by agents of the other great destabilizer. The reunited Irish people, themselves, are the most secure custodians of their own liberties.

I agree that a change in British policy must be encouraged and I further contend that the ultimate reunification of Ireland is an important element of a just and lasting peace for all Ireland; in the words of Padraic Pearse: "Ireland unfree shall never be at peace."

The United States is currently on friendly terms with all of the principals of this unhappy conflict, most especially with the United Kingdom. A true friend does not encourage error, but rather appeals to the other's better nature.

I shall encourage the Reagan Administration to pursue on behalf of the United States, policies which will persuade the British government that the orderly, phased reunification of a truly independent sovereign Ireland is not only historically and morally just, but is also a matter of enlightened self-interest for the United Kingdom and beneficial to the entire North Atlantic community.

Looking not only to the principle of Liberty, but also to the pragmatic, peaceful means of United States assistance in the achievement of Irish re-unification, I shall join my efforts with those of my friend, Chairman Mario Biaggi, and the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs as with any other sincere friends of Ireland in a variety of measures including the amendment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize economic relief and rehabilitation assistance for Ireland. I shall also continue to consult with County Executive Andrew P. O'Rourke, with Senator John E. Flynn, and with my constituents concerning issues of interest of Irish America.

With the Bicentennial of the American War for Independence still green in our

memory, let us not forget that the American debt to the Irish is not less than the debt we redeemed in France in 1917/18 and again in 1944.

REPORTS ON THE 24TH MEETING WITH THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT DELEGATION AND FACTFINDING MISSION TO PORTUGAL, ISRAEL, THE SOVIET UNION, AND AUSTRIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the 24th meeting between Members of Congress and of the European Parliament was held in Brussels, Belgium, on January 7 through 9 of this year—at an important time in the history of United States-European Community relations.

The U.S. delegation to the conference was cochaired by the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking majority and minority members respectively of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. Other members of the U.S. delegation were: J.J. PICKLE, of Texas; GUS YATRON, of Pennsylvania; LES AU COIN, of Oregon; HARRY REID, of Nevada; E. THOMAS COLEMAN, of Missouri; ROBERT E. BADHAM, of California; WILLIAM M. CLINGER, of Pennsylvania; DOUG BEREUTER, of Nebraska; MARK D. SILJANDER, of Michigan; and ALFRED M. McCANDLESS, of California.

In addition to the conference in Brussels, members of the delegation visited Portugal, Israel, the Soviet Union, and Austria and met with key government leaders and officials at each stop. The focus of these meetings were: First, Portuguese accession into the European Economic Community; second, U.S. bilateral relations and the internal political situation with all countries visited; third, arms control issues; and fourth, human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this time a detailed report I have received from the cochairmen of the U.S. delegation on the factfinding mission. This is followed by a separate report covering the agenda of the Brussels conference, including the U.S. presentations on these topics, and opinions and observations expressed by both delegations.

The Congress will face many of these issues this session, and I believe that the business in which this bipartisan delegation engaged is of serious importance and directly related to the participants' legislative responsibilities.

I strongly commend this material to the attention of my colleagues.

The reports follow:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 1985.
Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We respectfully submit our report on the 24th meeting between a delegation from the United States Congress and a delegation of the European Parliament held in Brussels, Belgium on January 7-9, 1985. Congressman Tom Lantos (D-Calif) chaired the U.S. Delegation; Congressman Benjamin A. Gilman (R-NY) served as co-chairman. Other members of the delegation included J.J. Pickle (D-Tex), Gus Yatron (D-Pa), Les AuCoin (D-Ore), Harry Reid (D-Nev), E. Thomas Coleman (R-Mo), Robert E. Badham (R-Calif), William M. Clinger (R-Pa), Doug Bereuter (R-Neb), Mark D. Siljander (R-Mich), and Alfred McCandless (R-Calif). The European delegation was chaired by Mr. Pieter Dankert of the Netherlands, a former President of the European Parliament. Messrs. Vincenzo Giannmarra of Italy and Rene-Emil Piquet of France served as the co-chairman.

This parliamentary exchange occurred at an important time in the European Community and in the history of European-American relations. The new European Commission, headed by Jacques Delors of France, had entered office on January 7th. Europeans and Americans alike looked forward to what new measures the Commission would implement to resolve many of the issues confronting the United States and the European Community. The new Commission was taking office at a time when economic questions were affecting U.S.-European relations more than at any time in the past twenty-five years. For the U.S. delegation, this meeting presented an opportunity to discuss these matters for the first time with members of the new European Parliament elected in June 1984.

The agenda of the two-day meeting focussed on trade, economic and political questions affecting our relationship. Although some members of the European delegation suggested that U.S.-EC relations were generally good, it soon became apparent that significant differences existed on several fronts, foremost of which was trade and agriculture.

ECONOMIC AND TRADE ISSUES

None of the agricultural disputes appear near solution. The European Community's reliance on subsidies through its Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) has enabled it to take markets from the U.S. farmers. The U.S. delegation expressed clearly its belief that the attempt to reform CAP in 1984 had not corrected the conditions which cause European surpluses. Briefly, the difference is that the United States tries to store a sizeable share of its agricultural surplus while the EC exports much of its surplus.

Representatives Tom Coleman and Doug Bereuter led much of the discussion on agricultural trade. Other agricultural issues discussed included the possibility of the EC's removal of duty-free status for imports of corn-gluten and soybeans. The U.S. delegation also stated its concern that the EC might alter the terms set for certain agricultural imports, especially soybeans, in order to adjust its economic system to the forthcoming admission of Spain and Portugal, scheduled for January 1986. The Europeans expressed much interest in the Reagan Administration's future farm policy and future Congressional action. With the Administra-

tion still determining its own position it was not possible for the U.S. delegation to make any definite prediction on farm legislation desired by the President. Several of the Europeans were very concerned about recent policy statements on U.S.-EC farm trade by Secretary of Agriculture John Block and stated their concern about a future trade war.

However, not all issues in trade were disputed as much as agriculture. The announcement on January 4, 1985 of an agreement between the U.S. and EC to limit imports of pipe and tube steel from the EC to 5.9 percent of the U.S. market made the issue moot. There was general agreement, too, about the importance of a new round in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), although the European delegation tied on conditions or observations. Most less-developed countries were not interested in a new GATT round if it discussed services—a topic of much importance to the U.S. and EC; the Europeans insist that the terms of the previous round—the Tokyo Round—should be implemented, which is an argument sometimes used to imply that the U.S. is not currently adhering to the GATT; and, lastly, that the U.S. should work toward an adjustment of exchange rates as part of a GATT settlement. The last condition was also part of a European argument that high budget deficits have affected the value of the dollar by making it high and thereby have caused a \$120-\$130 billion U.S. trade deficit in 1985—a point with which many in the U.S. delegation agreed.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND FOOD AID

A second general topic on the agenda was international development and food aid. Representative Gilman presented both an overview of U.S. and EC policies and an analysis of needed policy. Representative Gilman pointed out that more people had come to realize that the food problem goes beyond the need for more food production, that, in fact, it is interwoven with the need for economic development. He explained, too, the impact of international indebtedness on the food and development programs. The coordination of policy among developed nations was an especially important goal, and to that end Representative Gilman recommended the convening of a summit conference of developed nations to address the problem of world hunger and development.

The European delegates agreed with most of Representative Gilman's observations and added some interesting ideas of their own. Some of the Europeans thought the Community had been slow to organize its own efforts to assist famine-stricken Ethiopia. There was no criticism of U.S. policy toward Ethiopia, but the European delegation did suggest that the U.S. and EC should contribute a certain amount of cereals each year to the World Food Program. Some encouraged consideration of a moratorium on debt payments by the lesser developed countries (LDCs) in order to assist their development. When asked about their reaction to the Caribbean Basin Initiative of the United States, they commended the initiative's intent but decried its inadequate funding.

POLITICAL ISSUES

The remainder of the meeting concentrated on political issues and human rights. In a discussion of East-West relations, Representative Mark Siljander observed that the United States and the EC were stronger than the Soviet Union, which, he argued,

was faced with increasingly complex problems at home and abroad. The strength of the West put it in the position to negotiate a comprehensive arms control agreement concerning strategic, intermediate, and offensive space-based weapons, as well as chemical weapons. Furthermore, the West's strength would enable it through exploitation of opportunities to influence Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union toward democracy—an observation with which some Europeans disagreed.

The response of the European delegation was affected greatly by the meeting, occurring simultaneously in Geneva, of Secretary of State George P. Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. Like their American colleagues, the Europeans were greatly interested in the formula to emerge from Geneva, and they hoped any future negotiations would include the INF systems. The other major concern was the Strategic Defense Initiative proposed by President Reagan. In this system of sophisticated technology which could destroy incoming missiles, the Europeans saw a possible decoupling of the U.S. nuclear link and security commitment to the European allies. The U.S. delegation assured the Europeans that this was not the purpose of the SDI.

Closely related to the question of nuclear arms control was the issue of the western nations' conventional strength. Several Europeans endorsed the upgrading of NATO's conventional strength. Representative William Clinger argued strongly in favor of the new emphasis on conventional strength in NATO, which he discussed in the context of the debate surrounding the Nunn-Roth amendment that addressed NATO's capability and the possibility of removing up to 90,000 U.S. troops from Western Europe. Representative Clinger urged the Allies to try to meet the 3 per cent guideline on defense spending set in 1978 but emphasized his disagreement with the method used in the Nunn-Roth amendment to obtain Europe's adherence to the latter or agreement to take certain steps in increasing NATO's conventional capabilities. To the European Parliament, these issues have become of such importance that the Parliament, after the 1984 elections, established a subcommittee to deal with such questions.

Representative Gus Yatron opened a discussion on human rights with a presentation on human rights in the Soviet Union. It focused on the abuse of psychiatry, the continued existence of forced labor camps, and the harassment and persecution of Soviet Jews. Representative Yatron suggested that the Helsinki Accords and other documents had been an effective way of confronting the Soviet Union with its record on human rights in international fora. The European delegation shared Representative Yatron's concerns and noted the importance of the forthcoming conference in Ottawa in May 1985 in which the Soviets have agreed to discuss human rights. However, the European delegation noted areas where the West could face some embarrassment because of its human rights record—Central America, South Africa and Turkey. Turkey posed an especially awkward problem because of its status as a NATO ally; yet, in the opinion of some in the European delegation, it had not reached the state of democracy where it could join its allies in proposals to the Soviet Union.

The discussion on Central America examined differences between Democrats and Republicans in the Congress over this issue as well as the perspectives of the EC and its

members. Representative Tom Coleman reviewed present U.S. policy toward both El Salvador and Nicaragua. There is, Representative Coleman noted, a consensus in the Congress over assistance to El Salvador and support for the government of President Jose Napoleon Duarte. Republicans, as well as Democrats, desired the continuation of land reform and an end to the violent terrorism of the death squads on the right and left. On Nicaragua, there was far less agreement in the Congress because of the controversy surrounding covert assistance to the Contras. Representative Coleman suggested opponents of covert assistance used a double standard when they criticized human rights violations in El Salvador and overlooked them in Nicaragua. Many Republicans want a symmetry on U.S. policy, meaning an end to covert assistance if the Sandinistas likewise end their support for revolutions elsewhere in Central America and allow genuine elections and pluralistic democracy to develop.

Representative Harry Reid reviewed U.S. policy in Central America from the perspective of many Democrats. Representative Reid explained the reasons for opposition to the covert funding of the Contras in Nicaragua: The eventual public knowledge of the policy, its cost to U.S. credibility with its allies, and the strain on relations between the Executive and Legislative branches. Also, U.S. policy has risked violation of the charters of the United Nations and Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Representative Reid said the covert aid had been ineffective, although he recommended assistance to countries so they could interdict the flow of military equipment from Cuba and the Soviet Union.

The opinions of the European delegation were varied. There was strong support for the Contadora process and the formula discussed at the San Jose Conference in September 1984. The European perspective on El Salvador and President Duarte was very sympathetic, and the Europeans stated their support of the negotiations between the guerrillas and El Salvador's government. On Nicaragua there was less unanimity. Some Europeans argued that the outcome of the elections in Nicaragua had to be judged in the context of that country's history and not in comparison with the record of El Salvador or other Central American nations.

The meeting with the European Parliament delegation ended with a review by Representative Gilman of the problems of drug abuse and narcotics trafficking. Time constraints did not permit discussion of Representative Gilman's paper, and it was agreed the two delegations would look at this issue more closely in their next meeting in the summer of 1985. There was agreement as well to discuss Western security issues and NATO more extensively in the next meeting.

As part of the program with the European Parliament, the two delegations joined in a dinner hosted by the President of the European Parliament, Pierre Pflimlin. A prominent French statesman who participated in the creation of the European Community, President Pflimlin spoke on the importance of harmonious U.S.-European relations. The U.S. delegation also had a chance to meet with one of the new EC Commissioners, Willy De Clercq, and with the President-in-Office of the Council of the European Community, Mario, Floret. Both meetings touched briefly on trade issues which had

been discussed in more depth in the working sessions.

The new Congress will face major legislative decisions which will affect U.S. relations with Europe. These will come in matters of security, trade and general economic relations. We believe this exchange with the European Parliament has given the United States delegation a very clear indication of European opinion on many of these issues. This knowledge will prove very helpful as the Congress attempts to solve many of the problems before it.

Sincerely

TOM LANTOS,
Cochairman,
U.S. Congressional Delegation.
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Cochairman,
U.S. Congressional Delegation.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 8, 1985.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to you to report on a fact-finding mission to Portugal, Belgium, Israel, Denmark, the Soviet Union and Austria from January 4 through January 19, 1985. This trip included a meeting in Brussels, Belgium between our Congressional delegation and a delegation from the European Parliament. We are submitting a separate letter to you on this meeting, which was held on January 7-9. The delegation was co-chaired by Congressmen Tom Lantos (D-Calif) and Benjamin A. Gilman (R-NY). Other members of the delegation included J.J. Pickle (D-Tex), Gus Yatron (D-Pa), Les AuCoin (D-Ore), Harry Reid (D-Nev), E. Thomas Coleman (R-Mo), Robert E. Badham (R-Calif), William M. Clinger (R-Pa), Mark D. Siljander (D-Mich), and Alfred McCandless (R-Calif). In each country, it was the delegation's purpose to obtain an understanding not only of the nation's relationship with the United States but also an appreciation of the internal political and economic issues affecting its policies.

PORTUGAL

The delegation's visit to Portugal was part of the preparation for its meeting with the European Parliament. Portugal, along with Spain, which the delegation visited last year, is negotiating its admission into the European Community. For the United States, there are important implications from Portugal's membership in the EC. Not only will its economy be affected, but Portugal's young democracy will receive a strong endorsement from the ten members of the Community. Portugal will also have to make decisions affecting trade with the United States, and particularly trade in agricultural imports.

After receiving a briefing from U.S. Ambassador W. Allen Holmes, the delegation had meetings with Foreign Minister Jaime Gama, Minister of Agriculture Alvaro Barreto and Minister of Finance Ernani Lopes. The delegation also met with Prime Minister Mario Soares and Deputy Prime Minister Carlos da Mota Pinto. The Portuguese emphasized the importance of their membership in the European Community in our meetings. Portugal hopes negotiations for admission will be completed by March 1985, thereby enabling admission in January 1986. In explaining Portugal's objectives,

the Minister of Agriculture told the delegation that EC membership would promote more stability within Portugal and thereby assist the political stability and security of southwestern Europe. Portugal's stability would be the consequence of a strengthening of democratic forces in the country and of an improvement of its economic structure. Negotiations for admission had resolved many of the issues, but several remained, including fishing, which was close to agreement, and the status of Portuguese tomato paste, wines, cereals, olive oil, and sugar. In the opinion of Portuguese officials, delay of its membership was the result of confusion within the European Community and difficulties in the negotiation of Spain's admission, which with a larger agricultural economy is a greater threat to the Mediterranean members of the EC. The U.S. delegation listened with great interest, since 36 per cent of Portugal's agricultural imports (1982) come from the United States. The Portuguese cautioned that there would be a decrease in imports of grains and soybeans, but the full impact of this would not be evident until Portugal had become fully integrated into the EC ten years later.

Foreign Minister Gama raised several other issues in his meeting with the delegation. In response to questions, he stressed the importance of U.S. assistance to Portugal and emphasized the role of Economic Support Funding in encouraging more private investment in scientific, technical and business concerns. The Foreign Minister said that U.S. military assistance could aid Portugal's military in acquiring new technology, fighter interceptors, maritime patrol aircraft, and increasing mechanization of the army with more tanks. Negotiations with West Germany were progressing well on the construction of a new frigate. Turning to a question about the strength of the Communist Party in Portugal, Mr. Gama pointed out that Communist parties tend to be weakest in the developed countries in Europe—an observation that stressed the importance of Portugal's economic growth. On other issues, the Foreign Minister emphasized the importance of close collaboration with the United States in southern Africa, and explained that the lack of an embassy in Israel, which Portugal has recognized, was the consequence of financial pressures and concern about diplomatic retaliation from the Arab states. The U.S. delegation urged the Foreign Minister to send an ambassador to Israel.

BELGIUM

The primary purpose of the delegation's visit to Brussels was its exchange meeting with the European Parliament. However, the delegation did have meetings with the U.S. Ambassador to the European Community, George Vest, and with the U.S. Ambassador to NATO, David Abshire. The delegation also had a meeting scheduled with Belgian Foreign Minister Leo Tindemans, but weather delayed Mr. Tindemans and Deputy Foreign Minister Paul De Keersmaecker took his place.

The two U.S. Ambassadors presented a varied portrait of U.S. relations with West Europe. Ambassadors Vest noted the long-term continuation of trade and economic problems between the United States and the Community, which were discussed in greater length in the delegation's meeting with the European Parliament. One significant improvement in trade relations had been the resolution in early January of the dispute between the U.S. and EC over imports of tube and pipe steel from Community

members. A difficult time was ahead in U.S.-EC relations, but the overall U.S.-EC relationship was good, in Ambassador Vest's opinion. Ambassador Vest also commented that the institutions of the EC were beginning to take stronger interest in security issues, which means more attention to NATO affairs and the strength of the European voice within NATO.

Ambassador Abshire's remarks noted the unprecedented interdependence of economic and security issues in NATO but emphasized the positive steps NATO's members were taking to address the Alliance's needs. The Ambassador praised the leadership of NATO's new Secretary General, Lord Carrington, and observed that the Alliance's framework and institutions were generally healthy. He said the Alliance had been especially successful in establishing a consultative framework for INF deployment which would be a model for consultations regarding the forthcoming Geneva arms control negotiations. Noteworthy measures had been adopted in NATO's new six-year infrastructure agreement to improve minimal operation and air facilities—actions which Ambassador Abshire thought directly addressed criticisms of NATO's capabilities made in the Nunn-Roth amendment. In response to widespread concerns about NATO's conventional weakness and the consequent possible need of an early use of nuclear weapons, he said NATO was beginning to implement steps to upgrade conventional weapons and enlarge ammunition stocks. This improvement of conventional capabilities would be a leading priority for NATO during the coming years.

The meeting with the Belgian Foreign Ministry concentrated on the major issue in U.S.-Belgian relations, namely the beginning of the scheduled deployment of ground launched cruise missiles in Belgium in March 1985. Because the government of Prime Minister Wilfried Martens appeared to be wavering in its commitment to follow the schedule, the delegation asked about Belgium's intentions. Deputy Foreign Minister De Keersmaecker explained that a decision to deploy could have political repercussions in the country and bring about the defeat of the present coalition, which supports deployment, in elections scheduled later in 1985. De Keersmaecker warned that a government controlled by the opposition could halt deployment. Based on these remarks, it appeared likely that Prime Minister Martens would advise President Reagan later in January that actual deployment should be delayed until after the national election, thereby hopefully preventing the election of a government opposing deployment.

Other major bilateral issues discussed with the Deputy Foreign Minister included East-West technology transfer and Belgium's consideration of a nuclear cooperation agreement with Libya. To the former, Mr. De Keersmaecker stated a concern that the United States was seeking stricter controls on some forms of technology transfer to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union than Belgium preferred. As to the second issue, he noted Belgium's appreciation of U.S. concerns about nuclear cooperation with Libya but sought to assure the U.S. delegation that Belgium would follow a prudent course on this matter.

ISRAEL

The delegation's visit to Israel sought not only to gain an understanding of Israel's economic needs and its internal situation but also to acquire a sense of Israel's percep-

tion of major parties and issues in the Middle East. The delegation began its review of the Israeli situation with a briefing by U.S. Ambassador Samuel W. Lewis and the Consul General in Jerusalem, Wat T. Cluverius. Their presentations focussed on three issues affecting Israel—Lebanon, the national economy, and the status of the Middle East Peace Process. Ambassador Lewis commented that U.S.-Israeli relations had improved since the Israeli-Lebanese-U.S. agreement on Lebanon of May 17, 1983, but the Israel, itself, had become increasingly disillusioned with its involvement in Lebanon. Without Syrian withdrawal of its forces in Lebanon, Israel was prepared to begin a unilateral withdrawal of its forces, which is, in fact, what the Israeli government announced only a few days after the delegation's visit to Jerusalem and Tel Aviv. The economy was Israel's second problem, and here, the Ambassador noted some progress by Israel but added that additional measures needed to be taken if Israel were to receive higher levels of U.S. assistance. Three steps were especially important—improved management of the monetary system, a reduction of employment in the public sector, and the shift of more money and employment to the private sector. Turning to the third issue, the Middle East Peace Process, Ambassador Lewis and Consul General Cluverius cited examples of some progress—the reopening of channels between Egypt and Jordan, the recommencement of negotiations between Israel and Egypt over the status of Taba, and the more moderate policies of the new Israeli government on the West Bank.

The delegation then had meetings with the leadership of the Israeli government in both Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. The first meeting was with Vice Premier and Foreign Minister Yitzhak Shamir, who, in answering questions, gave a *tour de horizon* of Israel's foreign policy concerns. Mr. Shamir expressed his gratitude for the reference to the issue of Soviet Jews made by Secretary of State Shultz in his meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko in Geneva. Looking at Israel's neighbors, Jordan and Egypt, the Foreign Minister stressed the importance of finding agreement with Jordan but stated strong concern about the relationship of King Hussein with Yasir Arafat. Mr. Shamir said he could better assess Egyptian policy after the conclusion of the first round of talks on Taba, but he added his concern about Egypt's failure to normalize fully its relationship with Israel. When asked about the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Zone, the Foreign Minister remarked negotiations were nearly completed, the major remaining difficulty being textile imports into the U.S. from Israel. In response to questions about Israel's rescue program for Ethiopian Jews, Mr. Shamir explained Israel had acted to save them from a regime which was both pro-Soviet and anti-Jewish. The cost of the operation was undetermined, but it could run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

The focus of the meeting with Prime Minister Shimon Peres was Israel's role in Lebanon and the Middle East Peace Process. Prime Minister Peres stated his government's intention to begin a unilateral withdrawal of its forces from Lebanon and to take steps which would assure protection of Israel's northern region. These would be the maintenance of the Southern Lebanon Army, maintenance of the right to overfly Lebanon and patrol along its coasts, the deployment of UNIFIL north of the area con-

trolled by the Southern Lebanon Army, and an assurance that Syria would not move its forces beyond their present positions. On Jordan and the West Bank, the Prime Minister said Israel would attempt to persuade Jordan to participate in negotiations and that his government wanted to promote economic development for the Arab population on the West Bank and to encourage more local leadership.

Israel's security and defense needs were subjects examined in depth in two meetings. The Deputy Director General of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Hanon Bar-on, observed that the Soviet Union was striving to exacerbate regional differences in the Middle East and thereby to undermine the Peace Process. Although the Soviets had suffered setbacks in Egypt in 1972 and in the Camp David Accords, they had gained footholds in South Yemen, Ethiopia, and, most visibly, in Syria. With an army of 500,000 troops and 4,000 tanks, Syria's military strength surpassed that of any of America's allies.

Soviet assistance to Syria, particularly the provision of MIG-23s and advanced air-to-air missiles, was one of several points emphasized by Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin, who reviewed Israel's security posture and weapons needs. Mr. Rabin's assessment of Israel's present position was that it was generally secure but that Israel faced threats from Arab countries which had not signed peace treaties with Israel and from terrorism. Lebanon, he stated, could again become a base for terrorist attacks into Israel unless the Southern Army controlled the region in the south and an expanded UNIFIL force was deployed in other areas previously controlled by Israeli forces. Moving to Israel's military needs, Defense Minister Rabin stated that U.S. assistance was especially important for the supply of tanks, artillery, and aircraft. In the last category, he reiterated the importance of the next delivery of 75 F-16s which is to commence in 1986. When asked about the Israeli fighter aircraft, the Lavi, Mr. Rabin said production would begin in the 1990s. Approximately one-half of the Lavi's parts will be American manufactured, and Israel could not export the Lavi without U.S. permission since some of the technology used in the plane was subject to export controls.

The meeting with Finance Minister Yitzhak Moda'i concentrated totally on the state of Israel's troubled economy. Moda'i briefly explained the origins of the problems, pointing out as some of the reasons Israel's sixfold population increase since 1948, the lack of natural resources, the building of a national infrastructure "from scratch", and the cost of five major wars. At present, Israel faced significant budget deficits because of government overspending and high inflation, which decreased the value of revenue collected through taxes. Moda'i remarked that there was no other alternative to solve the problem than a quick, deep budget cut, but that, in addition, there would have to be structural changes in the economy and an accommodation of the needs of employees and unions. Because of Israel's serious shortage of foreign currency reserves, estimated to be no more than a two month supply, the Finance Minister stated that Israel had discussed with the United States the possibility of extending to Israel a safety net of foreign currency. Despite Israel's present economic problems, Moda'i remained confident about its future and predicted that it would begin recovery after a difficult period of 1-2 years.

Two other meetings with former Israeli ambassadors to the United States provided broad overviews of issues affecting Israel and the United States. In a luncheon hosted by Minister Without Portfolio Moshe Arens, the former ambassador commented extensively on the potential danger to Israel from Lebanon after the withdrawal of Israeli forces and the drain on the Israeli economy created by Israel's defense burden and the cost of its military presence in Lebanon. Simha Dinitz, now a member of the Knesset, pointed to the ongoing threat Israel faces from Syria. A militarily strong Israel is an asset to the United States and a requirement for Arab willingness to negotiate, since no Arab leader will negotiate with Israel if he believes he can destroy it. Ambassador Dinitz also explained that the present National Unity Government in Israel was a result of extraordinary problems posed by Lebanon and the economy. He cautioned the delegation that the government would survive strains presented by these two issues but that it could split over any other issue if either major party saw such division to its advantage.

DENMARK

The delegation's visit to Denmark was overnight, intended primarily to receive a Soviet aircrew in order to enter into the Soviet Union. However, the delegation had requested a briefing on Denmark by U.S. Ambassador Terence A. Todman and pertinent Embassy staff. Ambassador Todman outlined Denmark's role in NATO and the difficulty its present government has had in meeting some of its NATO obligations. Denmark's government, a four-party coalition, controls only 78 seats in a 175 seat Parliament. Consequently, the government has had to accept some defeats on NATO issues, most notably the Parliament's vote to withhold infrastructure funding for INF deployment. However, the government has not had to resign because of these defeats, and on a motion of no confidence would likely win because of the support its economic policies enjoy. Like most of its European neighbors, Denmark's economy has undergone hard times, and the government has responded by lowering spending in order to reduce the deficit. Defense is the only area in the budget where cuts have not been implemented, although there is a freeze on defense spending, but Denmark has tried to fill its NATO role in the Baltic.

THE SOVIET UNION

In Moscow, the delegation was briefed by U.S. Ambassador Arthur H. Hartman on the internal political and economic situation in the Soviet Union and on the current state of U.S.-Soviet relations. Its first meeting with Soviet officials was with representatives of the Institute of the USA and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences, including Director G.A. Arbatov.

Mr. Arbatov argued that U.S.-Soviet relations were still poor, and that while the agreement to begin new arms control discussions in Geneva was an encouraging step, nothing concrete had materialized. Arbatov also stated that past negotiations with the Reagan Administration had only been a cover for a U.S. arms buildup and a quest for military superiority.

Unless this attitude changed and a realization of the impossibility of nuclear war developed on the American side, Mr. Arbatov argued that the Geneva talks would fail to accomplish their purpose. Members of the U.S. delegation rejected the idea that U.S. policy supports the idea of a winnable nu-

clear war and stressed that Soviet human rights policy has made it difficult to foster the proper political atmosphere necessary for progress in arms control efforts.

The delegation also met with Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade A.N. Manzhu. Mr. Manzhu stressed the Soviet policy of just and equitable trade based on equality and freedom from preconditions and efforts to obtain political leverage on the issue of human rights. Manzhu also argued that past efforts to link trade to human rights issues had failed and that in 1984 U.S.-Soviet trade had reached a near-record level of \$3.5 billion.

However, Manzhu pointed out that legal instruments like the Long-term Grain Agreement and Most Favored Nations (MFN) status were needed to regularize trade and make it more predictable and reliable. He also criticized U.S. efforts to prevent Western Europe and Japanese companies from selling equipment and technology to the Soviet Union as an example of discriminatory trade policy that disrupted East-West trade. The delegation pointed out that human rights concerns were an inevitable and integral part of U.S. trade policy toward the Soviet Union and that both sides typically employ linkage in various aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations to advance their objectives.

The U.S. delegation held a highly productive session with Dr. O.N. Bykov, Deputy Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, and several staff members of the Institute. Bykov stressed that the Soviet position at the upcoming Geneva talks would include insistence on agreement in all three subgroups (strategic, intermediate, and space weapons) before agreement in any one of them could go forward. This insistence stemmed from the reality of the interaction of weapons in all three subgroups. Bykov also argued that the issue of the President's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) would be raised by the Soviet delegation because it undermines strategic stability by complicating the relationship between strategic offensive and defensive systems and forces both sides to compensate for the other's offensive and defensive deployment if the SDI is deployed and the ABM Treaty is scuttled.

The final meeting in Moscow took place with August Voss, Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Human rights concerns were repeatedly raised by the delegation, particularly with respect to harassment, detention, and arrest of Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate. Mr. Voss argued that criticism of the Soviet Union on the issue was "far-fetched and based on false information." He denied that there was no right to emigrate, that some 260,000 Jews have emigrated since World War II and that this accounted for the recent decline of emigration approvals from over 50,000 in 1979 to under 900 in 1984.

According to Mr. Voss, the relatively few denials for emigration were due to work in military related industries, access of applicants to classified information or because of an applicant's imprisonment for crimes under Soviet law. The delegation pressed Mr. Voss on these issues and presented a series of individual cases for his consideration and response.

Accompanying Mr. Voss was Yuri Zhukov, a political observer for the Soviet Communist Party newspaper, *Pravda*. Mr. Zhukov objected to the delegation's criticism of the Soviet Union's human rights policy and its

policy regarding the practice of religion. He pointed out that a recent visit to the Soviet Union by some 270 American religious officials was highly successful. That group visited Jews, Christians and Moslems in the Soviet Union and according to Mr. Zhukov returned to the United States stating there was no religious discrimination in the Soviet Union. Additionally, when pressed by the delegation about Soviet press reports that blamed the United States for the assassination of India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and for fomenting terrorism in Italy, Zhukov denied the Soviet press contained such articles. The delegation, through the U.S. Embassy staff, has presented copies of these articles to Zhukov for his further comment because the Members believed that the political atmosphere for constructive U.S.-Soviet relations is crippled by such irresponsible reporting.

In addition to raising human rights concerns with Soviet officials, the delegation also conducted a series of meetings with Soviet Jewish refuseniks, Soviet Christians, and divided family members. These meetings revealed a pattern of harassment that begins with the application to emigrate. Loss of job and subsequent charges of "parasitism", planting by authorities of drugs and small arms in refusenik apartments for purposes of arrest for "anti-Soviet slander", persecution of other family members including children of those seeking emigration, the formation of an official Anti-Zionist Committee to increase anti-Semitism, and pressure on Soviet Jews to conform to the system all indicate an increase by the Soviets of human rights violations that are associated with the recent downturn in U.S.-Soviet relations. These developments make it essential that the future conduct of U.S. relations seek to correct worsening human rights conditions in the Soviet Union to avoid a "detente without a human face."

AUSTRIA

The delegation's last series of meetings was in Vienna, Austria, where there were conferences with U.S. representatives to some of the arms control and international organizations in the city as well as with officials of the Austrian government. The delegation's first meeting was with our U.S. Ambassador to the Mutual Balanced Force and Reduction Talks, Maynard W. Giltman, who was shortly thereafter named to the American negotiating team at Geneva. Ambassador Giltman briefly reviewed the eleven year history of the MBFR talks and then explained the major areas of disagreement between the NATO and Warsaw Pact delegations. The major problems were the following: A geographical asymmetry which would allow the Soviets to pull back into designated number of forces into the western part of the Soviet Union but require the United States to remove its share of the reduced forces to the United States; a dispute over the number of military forces the Warsaw Pact claims it has in the region affected by the negotiations; significant problems in verification of the strength of ground forces; disagreements over the inclusion or exclusion of conventional arms in the negotiations; and the status of the West German army, which would have to disband a sizable number of its troops and place them into reserve units. Ambassador Giltman saw no agreement forthcoming on any of these issues.

The country team briefing was led by U.S. Ambassador Helene Von Damm, and it provided a review of the few issues which actually affect the very friendly relationship be-

tween the United States and Austria. A neutral and politically stable country, which has an economy that is outperforming many of its European counterparts, Austria faces no major internal changes except for the possible development of a "Green" movement comparable in its environmental interests to that in West Germany. Three bilateral issues received special attention in the briefing. Austrian policy on East-West technology transfer has caused concern in the United States, and U.S. officials have repeatedly urged Austria to take measures to reduce the diversion or export of sophisticated, militarily-related technology to Warsaw Pact countries. In December 1984 Austria's Parliament passed legislation tightening Austrian export controls, but their effectiveness must await a future test. A second issue is Austria's consideration of the Northrop F-5E as an interceptor for its air force. Austria is examining this aircraft along with aircraft manufactured in Britain, France, and Sweden, and it will likely make its decision by May 1985. The last issue concerned works of art which were seized by the Nazis after the end of the Second World War and which ended up in Austria's possession. Austria has returned some of these items to their original owners, but many remain in Austrian government hands. It is hoped that Austria will try to return as many as possible to the original owners and contribute either through donation or by their direct sale the value of the remaining art works to Jewish and Christian charity groups which work with surviving victims of Nazi repression.

After the country team briefing, the delegation met with the Minister of Public Economy and Transport Ferdinand Lacina. Mr. Lacina wished to discuss the impact of U.S. trade policy on Austria with the delegation. As an export-dependent country, Austria was greatly worried about the effect of U.S. anti-dumping restrictions on Austrian steel. Mr. Lacina stated that company record showed that Austria was not dumping steel into the U.S. marketplace. He also wished to assure the delegation that Austria did not wish to act as a loophole for the diversion of advanced technology to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, and that Austria had changed its laws in order to stop illegal transfers of technology. The U.S. delegation's primary concern was Austria's forthcoming decision on the F-5E. Lacina explained that Austria's decision would be influenced by its desire to purchase an aircraft at a reasonable price and by a public desire to avoid the establishment of a large military. He did add that Austria was interested in the offset arrangements to be available if Austria purchased the F-5E.

The meeting with Austrian Foreign Minister Leopold Gratz covered some of the same issues, particularly the status of the F-5E. However, Foreign Minister Gratz also desired to convey an understanding of Austrian foreign policy, which he pointed out sought good relations with its neighbors. At present, relations were good with Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Poland, the only problem being Czechoslovakia with which Austria had poor relations because of violations of its border by Czech border police. Turning to human rights and the status of refugees, Mr. Gratz expressed his hope that an improvement in U.S.-Soviet relations might allow for an increased emigration of Soviet Jews. He said Austria would continue to keep its borders open to refugees—a commitment which costs Austria about \$50 mil-

lion annually. Asked about the status of art works Austria acquired after the defeat of Nazi Germany, the Foreign Minister stated Austria intended to sell the unclaimed works and distribute the money to Jewish and Christian charities.

The last meeting with Chancellor Fred Sinowatz presented an opportunity to discuss Austria's general political situation. Chancellor Sinowatz referred repeatedly to Austria's neutral status and the nature of its outlook on Europe which had been shaped by the Austrian-Hungarian Empire—a longstanding historical entity whose post World War I components had been arbitrarily separated from one another by the Iron Curtain. Europe had been one, not two, bodies before this division. The Chancellor warned against the belief that the West could bring the Soviet Union down through economic pressure; its people had known immense hardship and could endure more. But as a neutral, Austria also wanted the United States to remain so strong that nothing could alter the international balance.

Austria was symbolically the proper place to end this trip. Its geographic and political position gives it a unique vantage point into both eastern and western Europe. It is the one nation from which the Soviet Union voluntarily withdrew its forces after the end of the Second World War. The important services it has given to human rights and arms control have made it an actor in two of the most important issues on the East-West agenda. Its role as a contact point between eastern and western Europe in business and culture is a reminder of the hope that someday the division of Europe can perhaps be peacefully ended.

Mr. Chairman, we believe this trip provided a valuable opportunity to learn on a first hand basis the issues which affect the relations of the United States with several of its key allies as well as with its leading political adversary. The Congress will face many important foreign policy decisions in the coming year, and we believe the knowledge gained from this two-week mission will help us in contributing to the deliberation of the Congress on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

TOM LANTOS,
Cochairman,
U.S. Congressional Delegation.
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Cochairman,
U.S. Congressional Delegation. ●

LIVING UP TO PAST COMMITMENTS: THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS AND THE BATTLE FOR BATAAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to redress a longstanding inequity in our treatment of a very special group whose vital services to our Nation have passed virtually unacknowledged. My first bill simply authorizes equal pay for equal risk for veterans of the World War II Philippine Scouts who fought so bravely as part of the U.S. Army. Second, I would like to introduce a companion resolution to ex-

press our deep gratitude to the people of the Philippines and Filipino-Americans who took up arms on behalf of the United States and Allies during World War II.

Before turning to the legislation at hand, I believe it is important to pause and reflect upon the events of over 40 years ago. Prior to the outbreak of war, when the Philippines were an American territory, a crack unit of Filipinos—known as the Philippine Scouts—was organized under the direction of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The unit, a fully incorporated part of the U.S. Army and never numbering more than 12,000 soldiers, was to serve a pivotal role in the valiant defense of the Bataan Peninsula. General MacArthur was later to describe the Scouts as "excellent troops, completely professional, loyal, and devoted." They were an elite organization with a high esprit de corps in which membership was considered an honor by Filipinos and the strictest standards were followed in selection.

In recruiting the Scouts, General MacArthur pledged, and I quote:

War is the great equalizer of men. Every member of my command shall receive equal pay and allowances based on the United States Army pay scale, regardless of nationality.

At the onslaught of the war in the Pacific when the enemy attacked Pearl Harbor and invaded the Philippine Islands, these soldiers became key to the success of our entire South Pacific strategy. It was the continued resistance on Bataan that denied the Japanese an essential base for the projected thrust into the South Pacific. The enemy was forced to retain large army and naval forces in the Philippines, which otherwise could have been employed against allied shipping of men and materials to Australia and New Caledonia from the United States and Middle East. Their protracted defense of these islands against incredible odds allowed the United States to recover from the first blows of the war and regroup for what would ultimately prove to be a successful counterattack.

The defenders of Bataan suffered extremely high casualties and many of those who survived the harsh conditions of battle did so only to be held as prisoners of war by the Japanese. On a tragic note, it is estimated that one out of every two members of the Philippine Scouts captured by the enemy following the collapse of the Allied effort at Bataan did not survive captivity. Other members fortunate enough to escape were organized in guerrilla units to carry on resistance efforts and to support the return of General MacArthur and his liberating forces.

Despite the valiant services of the Philippine Scouts who fought and sacrificed side by side with American soldiers, and despite the fact that the Scouts were a fully incorporated unit

of the U.S. Army, the Philippine Scouts received only a fraction of the regular pay received by their American counterparts. In fact, while an American private was earning \$30 a month during the war, a Philippine Scout with comparable rank and length of service received only \$9 for his exposure to the same hardships and dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come for Congress to redress this longstanding inequity in our Nation's treatment of this very special group of World War II veterans. The legislation I am introducing today to correct this injustice is direct and simple. It authorizes the Department of the Army to make a lump-sum payment to former Scouts or their survivors equal to the difference between the pay received by American soldiers of corresponding grades and lengths of service and the total amount actually received by the individual Scouts. In addition, this measure would direct the Secretary of the Army to redetermine the rates of retirement pay presently received by a small number of former Scouts to reflect adjustments in their basic pay. The latter provision is minor when measured in terms of dollars as there are now less than 300 former Scouts receiving regular or disability pay from the Department of the Army. In fact, as of 1979, the estimated cost of implementing the entire bill was set at a little over \$9 million. I think that you would agree that it is a small price to pay for a commitment ignored for over 40 years.

While the budgetary impact of these pay equalization measures is small, their symbolic value is immense. Congressional authorization of equal pay for the Philippine Scouts would provide a meaningful demonstration of our gratitude for their faithful and gallant service during World War II. I again urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.

Finally, as a complement to the pay equalization legislation, I am introducing a commemorative resolution to pay tribute to the people of the Philippines and Filipino-Americans who fought on behalf of the allied war effort in the South Pacific. My resolution would designate the week of April 1, 1985, as "National Philippine Veteran Week," marking the 43d anniversary of the historic battles of Bataan and Corregidor. It is only fitting that we take this occasion to express our gratitude for the loyal and courageous service of the Filipino people in the common struggle for freedom.

In addition to the fighting forces of the Philippine Scouts, the U.S. Armed Forces operating in the Pacific theater during World War II were aided by units of the Philippine Commonwealth Army and Naval Insular Force as well as the guerrilla units organized during the occupation of the islands.

Additionally, two units of Filipino-Americans—the 1st and 2d Filipino Regiments—were trained and assembled in the United States for service in the South Pacific.

Enactment of this resolution would provide a meaningful demonstration of our gratitude for the faithful and gallant service of Philippine soldiers and guerrillas in assisting the allied war effort during World War II. I urge my colleagues to join with me in honoring these special veterans, as they so justly deserve. ●

JUDGE KELLY'S DECISION IN JOHNSON VERSUS UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, a frenzy of litigiousness is sweeping the country. It seems that almost every loss, hurt, or damage is being attributed to the fault or responsibility of someone else. Lawyers are widely blamed for stirring up this kind of business, in which litigation plays a large role. One wit has said that justice is what lawyers study to circumvent. But the courts and legislatures, too, must assume considerable responsibility for the chorea-like affliction of legal claimmaking that is now epidemic.

Today, the Federal Government is the defendant in an extraordinary number of tort cases—probably over 40,000. Asserted claims exceed \$100 billion. These totals are climbing. It is important to bear in mind that the Government's defendant posture in these cases can lead to enormous outlays of taxpayer dollars, not considered at all in our well-publicized intention to cut the Federal deficit. We in Congress have not done enough to face this enormous problem.

Our courts often encourage inclinations to sue by loosening previously established criteria for liability, by making new law, or simply under the guise of dispensing fairness. But there are still some fine judges in the land.

With a good deal of pleasure—somewhat detectable from my letter to Judge Patrick Kelly of the U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas, which I include at the end of my statement—I recommend to my colleagues in the Congress, and to everyone else interested in topics such as those mentioned after this sentence, that they read the decision in the case of Johnson versus U.S.—handed down by Judge Patrick Kelly in November 1984. You will see how a judge can effectively cope with complicated scientific and medical issues, particularly in a case involving 53 witnesses, 42 days of testimony, thousands of exhibits, and more than 5,000 pages of trial tes-

timony; how a judge distinguished between sound and less validly held scientific opinions respectively offered under oath by different scientists of some renown; whether the opinions of scientists who were "heroes" in the Silkwood and other cases deserve special regard in other trials or, on the other hand, whether their scientific views and conclusions can be validly rejected; how a judge explains in clear, layman's language the types of ionizing radiation, radium 226, and its natural decay products; the health and safety impact of radium 226 with a half-life of 1,602 years, in an environment where radon gas is removed about as fast as it is generated; radium and radioactivity in our natural environment; radiation doses and applicability of safety standards; the history and development of radiation standards; how the scientific method works; statistical risk calculations; and that the label "hazardous" cannot be broadly tied to anything that is radioactive without an understanding of the doses involved.

Read Judge Kelly's decision in Johnson versus U.S. Whatever your background, you will learn something of interest.

This is the letter I recently wrote to Jude Kelly:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 31, 1985.

HON. PATRICK KELLY,

U.S. District Court for the District of
Kansas, U.S. Courthouse, Room 232, 401
North Market Street, Wichita, KS

DEAR JUDGE KELLY: Your decision in the consolidated lawsuits identified as Johnson v. United States is lucidly written, excellently reasoned, and solidly based. I must quickly add that I am not a lawyer. My opinion is influenced by my own background and experience—principally my association with nuclear matters for four decades during my service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and on the House Armed Services Committee.

I can appreciate the great extent of your patience and diligence, and the learning experience you rapidly acquired in health and safety aspects of nuclear radiation in the course of the trial. The testimony of 53 witnesses and the review of more than 5,000 pages of transcript amounted to a considerably body of information from which to distill essential validity.

I have had similar experience, but over a long period of time, not in a single episode. In legislative capacities, I too have had to listen to hypotheses and findings of nuclear scientists and related health and safety specialists, to distinguish between suppositions—however enthusiastically embraced—and objective findings, to pay close attention to diverse scientific views held by different professionals in nuclear fields and, most importantly, to ascertain and comprehend the views of the most preeminent scientists in particular disciplines.

Dr. Lauriston Taylor, Dr. Robley Evans, Dr. Robert Rowland—what can I say about such exceptionally knowledgeable and able persons except that they are great national assets. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy invariably sought their advice,

among other scientists held in high esteem by their peers.

You were outspoken in your judicial evaluation of the testimony of Dr. Morgan and Dr. Gofman. In the past, on the Joint Committee, I too had occasion to listen to their testimony on radiation effects. Suffice it to say that I and the rest of the committee were largely persuaded to accept the scientific principles and standards recommended by the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, the International Commission on Radiological Protection, and the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, and related thoughts expressed by preeminent scientists such as Drs. Taylor, Evans, and Rowland. As you did, we rejected the idea that—using the words in your decision—"all of the most eminent radiation scientists in this country and the entire world are as incompetent as Dr. Gofman claims, and that only Dr. Gofman has been able to define the true risks for radiation." From his testimony before the JCAE and his writing (including "Population Control Through Genetic Pollution," which he coauthored and was published in 1970 by Nelson-Hall Company), I can appreciate your judgment that—again, using words from your decision—there "is a bias in him which destroys his credibility as an objective witness in radiation cases."

Your decision was particularly interesting to me. I hope it is widely read because it deserves to be, in the national interest.

Sincerely,

MELVIN PRICE,
Chairman Emeritus.●

A TRIBUTE TO EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to officially inform the House today that in January of this year, last month, Edwin D. Eshleman of Pennsylvania died in Lancaster, PA.

Ed served in this body from 1967 through 1976. He was a distinguished legislator, an educator, who will be sorely missed by his friends, by the district that he served, and by this country.

I am today taking this special order in honor of Ed Eshleman who was a devoted and effective public servant and a man greatly loved by those who knew him and worked with him.

Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad at this time to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] who must get to another meeting, but wanted to participate in this special order.

Mr. GAYDOS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today we gather here to pay tribute to a former colleague of ours, Ed Eshleman of Pennsylvania, who passed away last month after fighting a losing battle with cancer.

Ed Eshleman served in this body for 10 years, from 1967 to 1976. In that span of time, Ed developed a reputation in the House as a man who cared

about how government affected people rather than how people affected government.

I knew Ed quite well. Not only did we start out together in the House, but we also served together on the Education and Labor Committee. In fact, we both served in the Pennsylvania State Legislature at the same time.

Ed was a colleague and a friend. He was concerned about his friends and his constituents.

A few days after Ed's death, a letter written by one of his constituents in Lancaster appeared in one of the local newspapers. I'd like to read that letter into the RECORD because it says what all of us today feel about Ed. The letter writer obviously knew Ed well, trusted him, and, even more, liked and respected him.

The death of our former Congressman, Edwin D. Eshleman, has brought forth richly deserved laudations from persons in every walk of life. Although Ed was a "rock-ribbed" Lancaster County Republican, he never allowed partisan politics to stand in the way of helping a Democratic or Independent constituent.

There are thousands of persons on the "other side" of the political fence who have been touched by the honesty, graciousness and very desire to help that marked our late Congressman.

Despite the heat and passion of political campaigning, never was the slightest implication raised that Ed was anything less than a man of uncommon integrity. Few men in political life have enjoyed such respect from all sides as has Ed Eshleman.

Ed liked to boast that he was a "stubborn Lancaster County Dutchman," but he was the first to suggest a sensible compromise solution when that seemed practical. Moreover, he served his constituents with a fidelity rarely seen today.

He had a knack of knowing—perhaps it was his political instinct—exactly what his constituents wanted, and he voted in accordance with the majority regardless of his personal feelings.

Ed knew very well that a small number of politicians were dishonest and corrupt, but that did not deter him from defending with all his vigor the principles and institution of representative government as well as the necessity for strong, healthy political organizations.

He will be missed by his legion of friends and admirers. But Ed has left a legacy that will serve countless generations of Lancaster Countians. What finer memorial could one have?

That letter, Mr. Speaker, gives us a better insight into Ed Eshleman than anyone of us here could. I would hope that when I leave Congress, my constituents can say the same about me as this one said about Ed Eshleman.

□ 1250

I conclude by thanking again my colleague for giving me priority in time, especially when the minority leader wishes to speak.

Mr. WALKER. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is the dean of the Pennsylvania delegation and who did serve with Ed Eshle-

man. His remarks are very much appreciated.

I would be very glad at this moment to yield to the distinguished minority leader of the House who served with Ed while Ed was in the Congress.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him especially for taking the time for this special order. It was news to me that Ed had passed away during the period in which we were not in session and would not have been privy to that news. I am sorry to hear that, because as I recall, when Ed left this House he was a relatively young man, did have his health problems at the time, and just felt that he wanted an easier way of life than pursuing the vigors of this particular job.

But aside from those beautiful things that have already been said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], upon which I certainly could not enlarge, other than my own personal knowledge of the way Ed worked here in the House during those 10 years, he was not the most flamboyant of our Members, the most raucous or one who would be on his feet every day, but he worked in a rather quiet, mysterious sort of way. I think that was probably in keeping with the conservative nature of Lancaster County and the people there.

We all knew, from the manner in which Ed conducted himself on this floor of the House, that that was the general nature of his constituency. And while they might, too, have been of quiet, reserved character, nevertheless every person in the country is deserving of having a voice in this House through their elected Representatives. As the gentleman has said, Ed represented his district so well, in keeping with the feelings and philosophy of that particular district.

I am certainly sorry to hear of his having passed, as I said, at such a relatively young age. He was one of those nice persons that we get to know in politics as friends whom we might otherwise have never ever touched. So, for me, I would look back on those 10 years during which I used to see Ed sit right over here, about the second or third seat in, and we would talk about a number of things. I personally feel that I have lost a dear friend in Ed's passing.

I appreciate the gentleman's opportunity for me to say just these few words in his behalf.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his very fine remarks.

Ed was very proud of the fact, after he left the Congress, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] had been elected as the minority leader because he very much appreciated his abilities while he was here.

I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. I want to thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Eshleman, who served this body for many years, was a dedicated Congressman who understood and served his constituency very well. In addition to this commitment to public service, Ed also knew how to enjoy himself.

Now, this was something I learned when I came to Congress. I knew all about Ed before I got here and before I ever met him, because, of course, he served with my dad—another hard-headed Pennsylvania Dutchman. In fact, I do not know how they made out when they disagreed on anything. But dad used to say and tell us about all of the wonderful characteristics of Ed Eshleman.

And then soon after I came here, my wife Hilda and I first met Kitty when Ed and Kitty and Hilda and I went on a trip with one of the committees to the Middle East. Even though we had to work long, hard hours on that trip, we also had a little time to play. I can remember, with great appreciation, the times we spent with Ed and Kitty on that trip. We were either pushing each other through the pyramids or we were trying to straighten each other's camels; but we just had a most enjoyable time.

And then what a magnificent example Ed set by showing the rest of us how to enjoy life. Even with his physical adversities, which could have made it very difficult for anybody else, it never made it difficult for Ed to enjoy life. Even though these adversities were strong at times, he showed the rest of us just how you can accept things and how you can show others how to love and how to enjoy life.

I think it is probably that characteristic of Ed that will help to sustain Kitty in these days and years to come. I think the greatest tribute that we could pay to Ed is to try to honor him by emulating his love of life and his love of people.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to share.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much.

I would be glad at this time to yield to another gentleman from Pennsylvania, another next-door-neighbor Congressman to Ed Eshleman when he served in this body, Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. SCHULZE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I, too, would like to thank him for taking this special order, a time when we honor a colleague who was much honored while he was here as an outstanding Member of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of working with Ed Eshleman when he served in this body, and I had the honor of knowing him personally over many succeeding years. He was a trusted friend. The very foundation of this country is its hard-working, self-sacrificing people. Ed was one of those people.

Ed was one of those people.

□ 1300

He had many careers and interests in his life, and the one common thread among them was that they were in the service of others. He had a deep desire to teach, to give our children all the opportunities possible to make good lives for themselves, and it was his hope that they would share with their communities some of what they had learned.

Ed was a man of the people. He gave support, and it was returned to him. He gave and received guidance. He befriended and was himself befriended. Each circle was complete and fit neatly within the other.

But that alone does not convey all of Ed Eshleman. He was a gentle, yet stern man. He did not tolerate dishonesty and was himself one of the most honest and forthright men I have ever had the good fortune to know. He had an amazing strength of character, but he did not allow that to overshadow or suffocate anyone. Still he knew his own mind and followed his instincts. He was a born leader, if there ever was one.

We remained friends throughout his long battle with cancer, and I can tell you that he did not change one iota. He suffered his pain quietly, continuing on his determined path to reach out to as many young students as possible and instilling them with a sense of duty mingled with adventure.

His hopes for America did not die with his passing. They are alive in each child he touched and in every man and woman he helped during his long and distinguished public service career.

He probably would not have thought of it as his bequest to his beloved Pennsylvania, but it is an enduring legacy to leave the world a little better than you found it. Measured in people, Ed Eshleman certainly left behind a lot of improvements.

When I first met Ed Eshleman, when I came to Congress, I was introduced to him as "Dutch" Eshleman, and I thought, where does that come from, this "Dutch" Eshleman? Then later I learned, of course, that he represented Lancaster County, which is historically the Pennsylvania Dutch area. In fact, I think that Ed Eshleman and his colleague, Mr. WALKER, coauthored a book on Pennsylvania Dutch, which I would commend to all to read.

But that Dutch Eshleman proved to be a very good nickname. He was a man of the soil. Those who know the Pennsylvania Dutch know that they are frugal, they are tough, and they get everything they can for as little as possible. They work their fields and their farms very well, and they

produce probably the best products that it is possible to produce in the agriculture field.

And that was Dutch Eshleman. That was Ed Eshleman. The products that he produced in Congress, the things that he worked on, were absolutely the finest that could be produced.

He was highly respected by the Pennsylvania delegation. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS] referred to a short time ago, we often meet. We meet on a regular basis as a delegation from Pennsylvania. I remember times when we would have a point in contention and things would go back and forth, and suddenly Ed would break into the conversation and everyone would be quiet. The room would quiet down, and Ed would sift from this complicated argument the succinct points, put them together, and everyone, protagonists and antagonists, would sit there and nod their heads, and an agreement was reached and we went on with the meeting. He was respected on both sides of the aisle.

Finally, let me say that I spent a lot of time with Ed in the woods. Ed was an outdoorsman. He was a hunter. He and his son Lee and my sons and I had almost an annual event going deer hunting. I know that you can tell a lot about a man when you work with him in committee or when you work with him in Congress or maybe on the golf course or someplace else, but I think a man's true character comes through when you are out in the woods and there are not a lot of people around to impress; you just sit and talk. That is when the real Ed Eshleman impressed me, with his basic honesty and his decency. When we would go hunting, he would bring a young man, either from Lancaster County or from somewhere else, and he would introduce him around, and I would say, "Ed, who is that young man?"

And he would say, "That boy would probably never have the opportunity to go deer hunting if he didn't come with me." He did not do it in a flamboyant way, but he wanted that young man to have the opportunity to know what it is like to not only enjoy hunting but to experience the outdoors and the communing with nature which goes along with it.

I had and still have nothing but the utmost respect for Ed Eshleman and for his memory. One of my regrets is that when they renamed the post office in Lancaster for Ed, I was unable to attend. I honored him mentally that day, as we do today.

Ed will be missed. I personally will miss him. I often ask when things get tough, "What would Ed Eshleman have done in this circumstance?"

I truly will miss Ed Eshleman, and I hope that his family realizes that over the years those of us who are Members of Congress often do not spend as

much time with our families as we would like, but I hope that his family in retrospect will realize the great good that he did, not only in Lancaster County and Pennsylvania, but for the country and the world as well. We miss him, we love him, but he will be with us always.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE] for his very fine remarks, and I appreciate his participation in this special order.

I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the distinguished minority whip of the House.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in this tribute to the memory of our former colleague, Ed Eshleman. I do come from another part of the country, but I did have an opportunity to serve here in the House with Ed Eshleman and got to know him and respect him and appreciate him and love him very much.

There are Members in this Chamber that you get to know when you serve with them on a day-to-day basis and that you grow to respect, and there are a few that you get to know as a gentle man. I think that applied to Ed Eshleman so appropriately. When there seemed to be a furor all around us, there always seemed to be a calm in the center with Ed Eshleman, and you could go back and find him in his usual spot here in the Chamber and you could seek his counsel, and it was always good, sound, low-key, but very valuable counsel.

I appreciated the relationship that I had in serving with Ed Eshleman here in the House. I did not know him as well or serve with him as long as some of the others here who have spoken before me today, but I do honor his memory and appreciate the fact that I had the opportunity to know this gentleman from Pennsylvania.

One of the things I observed about Ed that I think we could all take to heart was that he really did care about the people that he represented. You could see it in the way he conducted himself as a Member. You could see it in conversations with him. He was always thinking about their interests and what he could do as their Congressman here in Washington, to see that they were properly represented by the Government he had the opportunity to serve in. I think those are two valuable things we should remember about Ed Eshleman, that he was such a kind, gentle person, and that he was so concerned and caring about the people he represented in Pennsylvania.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for having

this opportunity for us all to express our appreciation for him and to extend our best wishes to his family as we remember the great service he gave us.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I know Ed Eshleman appreciated, when the gentleman from Mississippi came to Congress, that this was going to be one of the young leaders of the future, and he was certainly right in that regard. I thank the gentleman again for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague and esteemed colleague and congratulate him for taking out this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute today to our former colleague, Edwin D. Eshleman, whose long and gallant battle against cancer ended last January 10 when he died at the age of 64 at home in his beautiful and beloved Lancaster County, the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country.

Those of us who were privileged to know and serve with Ed Eshleman always will remember him as a warm and unpretentious person whose industry and plain ways marked him as a man of the people he served. Through his many hospital bouts caused by cancer, he would return to his duties in the U.S. House of Representatives where his driving interest was in the field of education.

A five-term Member of Congress, first elected in 1967, Ed Eshleman began his public-service-oriented career as a school teacher. He served in Pennsylvania State government and was elected in 1955 to the first of six consecutive terms in the State assembly. Establishing himself quickly as a solid, hard-working public servant, Ed Eshleman rose rapidly to leadership positions both in the Pennsylvania house and the Republican Party. He served as chairman of the house education committee, assistant Republican leader, majority whip, and later as minority whip. He was an influential force in strengthening and redirecting the Commonwealth's education programs.

Ed Eshleman's unquenchable thirst for improvement and excellence in education continued during his service in the U.S. Congress. As a respected and nationally recognized spokesman on education issues, he served as ranking member of the House Education and Labor Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and later as ranking member of the Select Education Subcommittee.

A Coast Guard veteran of World War II who won a commendation for conduct in action, Ed Eshleman was honored by Congress in 1983 when the

post office in Lancaster was named for him. It was an honor well-merited for a gentleman whose contributions to our Nation's education system were matched only by his community efforts in his native Lancaster County.

Ed Eshleman, in his busy career and continuing fight against cancer, found time to write a book, "Congress, Pennsylvania—the Dutch Representatives." He was aided in writing the book by his administrative assistant, ROBERT S. WALKER, who succeeded him as U.S. Representative.

After retiring from Congress, Ed Eshleman returned to his career roots, serving as a circuit teacher at area colleges and high schools. From a deep personal commitment, he fought the disease of cancer, not just for himself, but for his fellow citizens. He was chairman of the local American Cancer Society's fund-raising efforts and served his community in other volunteer capacities.

That he will be missed by his friends and former constituents in Lancaster County is undisputed. He served them and the U.S. House of Representatives with honor and distinction. His contributions at the national, State, and local levels in serving the public are highlighted by his accomplishments in the field of education.

I hope his wife and family are comforted by the knowledge that Ed Eshleman left a legacy of devoted and effective public service, and of respect and warmth by those who knew and worked with him.

□ 1310

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

The gentleman knows that Ed Eshleman appreciated the relationship that he had with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] over the years that they served in two legislative bodies together and I thank the gentleman again for his remarks.

Ed Eshleman was my predecessor in the Pennsylvania 16th Congressional District seat. He was also my boss, because for the 10 years that he spent here in the House of Representatives, I had the privilege of working on his staff for that entire period of time.

I learned a great deal from him in that period of time, because Ed Eshleman was an educator in the finest tradition. He really lived by Plutarch's maxim that, "The very string and root of honesty and virtue lies in good education."

He intuitively knew that the most basic function of a legislator is to educate, and he did it well.

Born into a family of educators and raised in Millersville, PA, he was the son of Reeder and Mary Green Eshleman, from whom he inherited a fierce pride and sense of devotion to community involvement. His father was a prominent educator who later became

the Lancaster County Superintendent of Schools and he instilled in his son the solid values of education, civic activity, and hard-nosed integrity, the legacy which is now passed on to his family and to all those whose lives he touched during almost 50 years of service to the people of Lancaster County.

He graduated from Penn Manor High School, but his education at Franklin and Marshall College was interrupted by World War II. During his 18 months of service, where he saw action in Anzio, Salerno, and Normandy, he received commendations for his conduct as a lieutenant.

He returned to graduate from Franklin and Marshall and later did graduate work in political science at Temple University.

After the war, he began his formal teaching career in the Lancaster County public schools. Reflecting his commitment to the ideal of strong mind and strong body, he also coached high school basketball teams, once leading his teams to back-to-back championships, which was one of his proudest accomplishments. In fact, through most of the 10 years that Ed was in the House, he and I would drive back and forth to Lancaster County, and when he reflected on many of those trips about his career, it was not just a lot of his political accomplishments that he would talk about, but rather the accomplishments as an educator, particularly his accomplishments when he coached what he regarded as one of the finest groups of young men that he had ever had a chance to deal with.

He entered State government as the director of the State bureau of county audits in Harrisburg in 1949 and moved on from there to become executive assistant in the Pennsylvania Treasury Department.

He won the first of his six elections to the State House of Representatives in 1954. It was there that he began to show the innate legislative skills and leadership qualities that would serve him so well in the State house and later when he became a Member of Congress.

Years afterward, when he was asked why he entered politics, he remembered the advice of Graybill Dean, the late Lancaster County Republican chairman. Graybill Dean had told him at that time, "The big fellow has the know-how and the wherewithall to take care of himself, but the only person the little fellow has is his elected official."

Ed took that advice to heart and it was put to good use for the remainder of his career. It was that dedication to helping the little guy that became Ed Eshleman's trademark in public office, earning him the reputation for honesty and integrity that would serve him well for the rest of his life and serve so

many others that he touched during his life.

In the Pennsylvania General Assembly, he quickly rose through the ranks to occupy leadership positions. He became chairman of the house education committee, where he could devote his energy and attention to improving the quality of education in the Pennsylvania public schools.

He was elected majority whip, reflecting the confidence that his peers placed in him.

Very few State legislators ever reach national prominence while they are serving in a State legislature, but Ed did and he did it in very typical fashion, quietly, forthrightly, yet effectively.

When the Supreme Court in 1962 held that prescribed prayer and Bible reading in the schools was unconstitutional, it was a Pennsylvania case, the Abington against Schempp case, that was at issue. Ed moved to change the wording of the State law to make the Bible reading exercise voluntary rather than mandatory. His action called for simply changing the law to read "may" rather than "shall," but the State senate changed the language back to mandatory. The house bill went on to become law, however, and it made the existing statute a moot question, and as a result of that simple change of a word the Supreme Court, the U.S. Supreme Court's implementation of the prayer ban was delayed in our State for a full year.

Though he received national prominence, he never lost sight of his duty to his constituents and in particular helping the little guy. It was the fierce dedication, combined with integrity beyond reproach, that proved to be the decisive factor in his seven-way primary race for Congress which he won in 1966. He won an easy election in the general election that November and was never seriously challenged in the four elections that followed. The confidence placed in him by the voters of the 16th District would prove well founded.

Jack W.W. Loose, who is one of the foremost experts in Lancaster County, PA, history profiled the spirit of the typical Lancasterian in a foreword to a book Ed and I coauthored called "Congress, Pennsylvania—The Dutch Representatives," which was referred to earlier by one of my colleagues. Jack Loose says in that book, the portion which he authored:

Always responsive to the challenges, for that is what brought most settlers here originally, but never rash nor gullible, the solid citizen of the Pennsylvania Dutch district has relied on his limitless faith in God and himself. His religious heritage has taught him that he is responsible for his own decisions and for his own welfare. Self-reliance is a virtue that he had developed to an uncommonly high degree. He may be unsophisticated and direct, but he is intelli-

gent, perceptive and wary of new-fangled notions. His heritage has stimulated him to pursue private enterprise relentlessly. The same guide admonishes him to conserve his capital, borrow cautiously and employ the investment of others with the same care as applied to his own. He is strict with himself and he expects the same from those he elects to serve in his government.

Those were the character traits that Ed Eshleman brought with him to Washington as he served in Congress for 10 years from 1966 to 1976. Much of what Jack Loose writes about was very much involved with the legislative philosophy that he had with him, the votes that he cast and the legislation that he sponsored in this body.

Once again, in coming to Washington he was able to secure for himself a seat on the House Education and Labor Committee, allowing him to further his lifelong interest in improving educational quality. He rose to become the ranking Republican on the Agriculture and Labor Subcommittee and then moved to become the ranking Republican on the Select Education Subcommittee and later became the ranking Republican on the Postsecondary Education Subcommittee. From those vantage points he established himself as an effective concerned voice on education issues, overseeing the creation and implementation of the many college assistance programs that have educated millions of college graduates and students. As he did in committee, he quickly earned a reputation on the House floor as someone who could be depended upon for solid advice, continuing to build his career around the idea that blunt honesty, brutal though it may be at times, still had a place in modern politics. Not one for flashy or headline grabbing statements, as he wrote himself in his book, he was an independent voice and his voice is usually the result of an independent judgment that he made, rather than any political or ideological expediency.

His counsel was often sought on the House floor because he was known as a representative who was not afraid to speak his own mind on policy matters.

He also left his mark on constituent operations. He was the first representative in the Pennsylvania Dutch seat to expand his congressional office operations and use modern technology to turn his district office into an aggressive problem-solving unit, reaching out to help his constituents.

In order to increase communication between himself and his constituents, Ed began the first regular series of newsletters, radio reports, newspaper columns, and questionnaires. He put in a hotline telephone service between Lancaster and Washington. In addition to returning home every weekend, he established a procedure for holding regular congressional office hours in post offices throughout the 16th District.

□ 1320

As a result, he developed a near-legendary rapport with the people that he represented, never losing his ability to see issues not through the eyes of a Washingtonian looking at Lancaster County, but through the eyes of a Lancaster countian looking at Washington.

One of his former staffers relates a story in which he had to draft a press release for Ed that was to go back home. As is sometimes the case, a little more "Washingtonese" than needed to be had crept into the release. After reading it, Ed leaned back in his chair, looked at the staffer and said, "Well, you can write, but is anyone in Rawlinsville going to want to read it? Write it so the people in Rawlinsville will read it." This staffer happened to be from Rawlinsville.

The message came through loud and clear: Remember your roots, remember the people back home and cut out the bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo. From then on, rather than asking "Will it play in Peoria?" the standard question in writing a press release, constituent letters or anything having to do with the district became: "Will they want to read it in Rawlinsville?"

The late 1960's and the early 1970's, as anyone who lived through them knows, were one of the most turbulent periods in our Nation's history. Decisive, gut-wrenching debates over the Vietnam war, the assassinations of Bobby Kennedy and Martin Luther King, the subsequent race riots and demonstrations, the elections of 1968, and finally the pain of Watergate and the fall of South Vietnam were all events that seared the national conscience.

All Americans were tested, but none more so than our elected officials. Ed would later call his decision to support impeachment of former President Nixon one of his most soul searching, and made so much more because Nixon was so extremely popular in his district. And he would later call his vote to continue the Vietnam war his most difficult to cast.

Another of his tough decisions was to support admitting the Vietnamese boat people into America, despite the fact that his constituent mail was running heavily against that kind of immigration policy. His reason for supporting the Vietnamese was something which comes as close to providing insight into Ed Eshleman's philosophy as any of his public comments.

He said, "Should we have let them float? We are a Christian Nation; 70,000 people fled in panic, what could we do? I don't think there's much question of what you do, not if you want to be able to look at yourself in the mirror in the morning when you shave."

Ed's rock-ribbed integrity, blunt honesty, and fierce devotion to his

family were the anchors that pulled him through those years. Dealing with thorny national issues was not the only problem he faced, however. He also had to come to grips with serious personal health problems; two bouts with cancer, and open heart surgery. Through it all, he dealt with those problems as he did with all others: bluntly, forthrightly, never shrinking from the task ahead and perhaps most importantly, with a sharp sense of humor.

The people of the 16th District rallied behind him as he battled through operation after operation for his cancer and heart troubles. His openness and candor about not only Watergate and the Vietnam crisis but also his health problems, reinforced his constituency's respect for him, and in so doing, he managed to turn what would be for ordinary politicians a major political liability into real political capital.

Despite his personal problems, Ed thrived on his ability to work with and help the voters of the 16th District. "Always put more marbles on the pile than you take off—if you don't, you soon run out," was one of his favorite sayings. He never ran out. Always adding more marbles to the pile and benefiting peoples' lives immeasurably while doing so.

But to Ed, regardless of all else, family always came first. Ed genuinely enjoyed his family. The faster he could get out of Washington at the end of the week and back home to Kitty and their two sons, Bruce and Lee, the better. And it was to them that he returned after stepping down from Congress in 1976.

When he stepped down, though, despite the health problems, he also went back to teaching; he resumed his teaching career becoming a, something that he created, a "circuit teacher," touring college campuses and high schools to pass on the reflections on his life as a public individual, about the workings of Government and in an imperfect world.

More than anything else, he wanted the next generation to learn the lessons that he had learned, to see the flaws that he had seen and to avoid the mistakes that he had made, so that they could enjoy the same opportunities that he had enjoyed. He said:

If I can only light a few sparks within the students to get involved in the political process, then it is all worth it.

He seemed to instinctively know, as it seems all good natural educators do, that as Henry Brooks Adams has written, "A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

Ed lit more than a few sparks; his influence lives on in Lancaster County and among all those whose lives he touched. He gave much more to the

community and to Lancaster County than he ever took from it. Those of us who were fortunate enough to know him, to be counted among his friends, know that he added much more to our lives than he ever asked in return. I regarded him as a mentor from whom I learned much, but more than that, he was a friend.

"He was a gutsy man," Charlotte Reinhold, executive director of the Lancaster County Cancer Society said upon hearing of Ed's death. Her comments sum up the feelings of everyone who knew him and who knew of his work to battle the disease that would eventually take his life.

"He was the only man ever to lead three cancer crusades for us," she added. He threw himself into the fight against cancer not only for himself but for all the millions of others who were afflicted by that disease.

Upon learning that his cancer would be terminal, Ed didn't flinch or feel sorry for himself. Instead, he lived the rest of his life by the quote from Peter Marshall's book, "It is not the duration of life that counts, but it is the donation to life that matters."

With that as his guide, he spoke before group after group of cancer patients, constantly imploring them not to give it, urging them on and telling them to live the rest of their days with the zest that he did.

Through tireless efforts, he more than doubled the amount of contributions to the Lancaster County Cancer Society in just 1 year. In recent years, he submitted himself to experimental test after test, many of them resulting in excruciating pain, all the while knowing that the test would be of no benefit to him, but still hoping that they would yield a clue to a cure that would help future patients.

His battle, and the way he fought it, was an inspiration to all of us. John Bergey, president of the Lancaster County cancer unit said upon hearing of this death,

Ed Eshleman was much more than a fine statesman, teacher, and citizen of Lancaster. Unbeknownst to most, Ed spent countless hours volunteering his time to help conquer the dreaded disease of cancer. We * * * will miss him, but his legacy of concern will live for a long time.

As another of his former staffers says, he never complained or wondered, why me? Although given the circumstances he had every reason to. Instead he plowed on, knowing that what he was suffering and what was being learned because of it would perhaps help someone else some day.

That was really Ed Eshleman.

Through it all, he never lost his quick sense of humor; that was amply demonstrated in dedication proceedings last year for the Lancaster Post Office that was named in his honor. Mr. SCHULZE referred to it a little while ago.

Despite his poor health, he was there, and the wit sparkled through when he said, "Whenever the postal rates are hiked, I want my name taken off—at least for a couple of months." I assume he will want his name taken off right about now.

He lived his life with energy and devotion, and he was one who cherished the heritage from which he came; his family; he was a man who loved his country and fought for a better tomorrow for all Americans.

In the epilogue to Ed's book, another distinguished historian of our area who just happens to be my father, Dr. Joseph Walker, writes:

From the opening of the Continental Congress * * * the holder of the Dutch Seat has had a reputation among his colleagues for hard work, stable counsel and service to constituents. He has sometimes been in the foreground, as was Frederick Muhlenberg—the first speaker of the House of Representatives—James Buchanan or Thaddeus Stevens. More often he has exerted his influence through the effective service on committees, consistent research of legislative matters before the House, and good relations with the leadership in the executive branch * * *. For 200 years, Lancastrians have filled the Dutch Seat with solid, useful men who reflect accurately its own steady, diversified progress and prosperity.

Ed Eshleman maintained that standard of excellence, carrying on the tradition as it was passed on to him. He skillfully blended the two roles, becoming a national influence on matters of concern to his constituents, never letting his national attention overshadow his responsibility to his constituents.

At the same time, he never let official business detract from family life; understanding that this family was a vital part of the team that allowed him to represent the 16th District so well.

Not many men move through life like Ed did, fighting the battles he fought, asking the questions he asked, taking on the causes he took on, and yet still managed to emerge with their reputation and their integrity fully intact.

□ 1330

It is a testimony to the strength of his character that Ed Eshleman did. He will be missed as a husband. Kitty Eshleman was certainly his partner throughout this whole public career. He will be missed as a father. He loved his sons like no man has loved a family. He will be missed as a teacher. And I will say he will certainly be missed as a friend.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend and our former colleague, the late Edwin Eshleman of Lancaster, PA, who passed away earlier this year. I had the privilege of serving with Ed during his 12 years in the Congress and I greatly respected his work and

service to his constituents of the 16th District of Pennsylvania.

Ed was a fine man and an outstanding legislator. My sympathies go out to his wife, Kathryn, and his two boys, Bruce of Elton, SC, and Lee of Harrisburg, PA.

All Pennsylvania citizens and particularly those in the Lancaster area benefited from the years of public service by Ed Eshleman. Ed served Pennsylvania and the Nation at the local, State, and Federal levels with vigor and devotion. During his 10 years on the Education and Labor Committee, he became a nationally known figure in his efforts to improve opportunity in the area of education and personal development. He was a key figure in several efforts to improve America's system of education and his legacy in that field continues to live on.

I am proud that we saw fit to honor Ed by naming a post office building in his honor during the 98th Congress. It is so much more meaningful that Ed was with us and able to be recognized by this tribute to this long and generous service as a public servant. It is equally fitting that this House pay tribute to him for his dedication, loyalty, and concern.

Those of us who served in the Congress with Ed will long remember his contributions, both in office and in private life. We also will remember the personal warmth and cheer that he brought to those of us who consider him a friend. I speak for all of his friends when I say we will all miss Ed very much.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER, who was Ed's administrative assistant, for taking the time today to honor our friend.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman McDADE has quite eloquently portrayed our acquaintanceship with our former colleague, Ed Eshleman, and I simply wanted to add to the record my recollections, all warm ones, of his service in the Pennsylvania General Assembly and in the U.S. Congress. He was a fine gentleman.

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to help honor and pay tribute to a distinguished former Member of this body, the late and most esteemed Congressman Edwin D. Eshleman. My tenure in the House of Representatives overlapped with Congressman Eshleman's for four terms and I was also privileged to have served with him in the Pennsylvania General Assembly for 4 years. Our congressional districts were adjacent and we were thus close to many of the same issues.

Congressman Eshleman was first and foremost a teacher and throughout his public career he was known as a gifted educator and advocate of edu-

cation and higher learning. He shaped education programs at the State level and influenced the course of public education policy at the Federal level. An eloquent discourses, Congressman Eshleman was always depended on to reason through the problems and issues of our day and to articulate their solutions with a clarity and logic that made them readily apparent and easily implemented. The contributions Congressman Eshleman made in Congress and through all the years of an extraordinary public career are too great and numerous to measure. Their salutary effects have been long lasting and they will continue to help many in the years to come.

I am thus proud to join in praising the memory of our late distinguished colleague, in commending the value of his public service, and, in thanking him posthumously for all his life's work and beneficial achievements. I know I join my colleagues as well in a more poignant offering of condolences to Congressman Eshleman's wife, Kathryn, and their two sons. ●

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague Bob WALKER for arranging this special order to pay tribute to Congressman Ed Eshleman. I was privileged to serve with Ed and was deeply saddened to learn of his passing on January 11, 1985.

Ed joined us in Congress in 1966, having already served the people of Lancaster for 10 years in the Pennsylvania State Assembly. He brought with him a profound and sensitive understanding of the problems facing American education and a deep desire to improve the lives of his constituents and Americans across the country.

Recognized immediately as an individual with insight and perseverance, Ed was assigned to the Committee on Education and Labor. He rose to positions of leadership on two subcommittees and became a national spokesman and a recognized expert on postsecondary and select education.

Ed retired from Congress in 1975, but those of us who knew him knew that this would not be the end of Ed Eshleman's service to his home community. From his new vantage as citizen-scholar, Ed continued to shape politics in Lancaster until he succumbed to cancer.

Ed Eshleman established a standard toward which we all should strive. He cared deeply for his constituents and he worked hard to improve the lives and educational opportunities of all Americans. His death is a personal loss, and I would like to offer my condolences and best wishes to his wife Kitty, and his sons Lee and Bruce. ●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE AFRICAN FAMINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, drought in Ethiopia and 24 other African nations, has been and continues to be extraordinarily severe. Lasting as long as a decade in some regions, the scorching drought has laid waste to parts of central Africa, turning much of mountainous highlands there into a brown uninhabitable moonscape.

Relief workers in Ethiopia say that 1 million people could die there in the coming year. While Ethiopia has grabbed the world's attention, the crisis is much wider. The United Nations Food Agriculture Organization [FAO] has said that more than half the countries of Africa may need food aid in the coming year. Besides Ethiopia, there is famine to the point of starvation in parts of Sudan, Chad, Mali, and Mozambique. Severe hunger has also been reported in Zimbabwe and Zambia.

The images are becoming familiar around the world. Dying children with aged faces; holocaust-like camps where limp and almost lifeless human beings wait passively for bowls of gruel; stretcher bearers setting out at sunrise to collect the night's harvest of dead bodies.

Triggered by these haunting images, questions of blame and responsibility are being asked abroad with growing outrage: Did nature cause this horror or did man? Regardless of the cause, what continues to be baffling is that we are in on the threshold of the 21st century. With all of the technological advancements of man in our generation, how could this tragedy have been overlooked for so long? It is truly

ironic that the continent that is credited for the origin of man, must suffer the consequences of neglect by his own.

Fortunately, the rest of the world is recognizing this crisis, and help is coming. For the 24 countries most seriously affected by the drought, an estimated 3.3 million tons of grain will be coming this year. About 30 international agencies and governments of the developed world have pledged 2.3 million tons of grain and a large share of additional contributions will come from the U.S. Agency for International Development.

A recent trip to Africa permitted me and my colleagues that accompanied me, to observe with striking clarity the devastating effects of famine on the people of that continent. Much of what we saw and learned reinforced my conviction that the United States must act swiftly to reduce the deadly toll of famine on the African Continent.

My colleagues and I returned home more committed than ever to making increased famine relief and recovery assistance for drought-ravaged areas of Africa an urgent legislative priority in the 99th Congress.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman SILVIO CONTE and Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA for scheduling this special order to bring to the attention of this body and the public the severity of the hunger situation on the continent of Africa.

As we stand here today, the worst human disaster in recent history is happening in Africa. Estimates run as high as 35 million people—a number equal to one-sixth of the population of this country—are directly affected by the drought conditions on the continent. United Nations officials have also estimated that up to 23,000 people may die each day unless relief is found. At that rate, the number of Africans who will die in 1 year might equal the number of residents in New York City.

The American response to this tragedy has been overwhelming. The American people, as is often the case, have responded quickly and generously to the threat of starvation. According to a January 1, New York Times article, the American public had donated more than \$40 million in 2 short months for aid to starving Ethiopians through various private relief and development agencies. The U.S. Government has also responded by providing approximately \$370 million in emergency aid to the continent of Africa since October 1, 1984.

So why with this outpouring of support through the generosity of our citizens and our Government are we here today expressing our concerns about the ever-worsening conditions in Africa? Because we are not doing enough. It is extremely hard for those of us in the United States to come to the stark realization that despite our ever-increasing efforts, we have not been successful in our fight to combat world hunger. As an example, 10 years ago, member nations of the United Nations made a historic commitment to eliminate world hunger within a single decade. However, today, even though those member nations are still committed to that goal, there is even more hunger in the world.

In the early 1960's, President John F. Kennedy laid out two goals for this Nation: One was to get a man to the Moon before the end of the decade, which we did. The other was to eliminate hunger "within our lifetime." Unfortunately, that goal is as elusive today as it was then.

How can this be? America is recognized as the world's breadbasket. In my own congressional district in Maryland, lies the world renowned Beltsville Agricultural Research Center. The Center is primarily responsible for research leading to increases in food yields. Scientists test new fertilizers which may aid food production efforts in the more arid parts of the world, such as the Sahel region in Africa. Elsewhere throughout our Nation and our world, efforts have been and will continue to be made to alleviate world hunger. Yet we are still behind in our efforts. As an example, Africa is the only continent in the world that grows less food today than it did 20 years ago.

The United States has shipped to the country of Ethiopia alone approximately 276,000 metric tons of emergency food pledges since October 1. Yet it is estimated by the United Nations that the total food deficit of the 20 drought-affected countries for the 1984-85 crop year is 6.8 million metric tons of cereal grain.

We can't stop the suffering completely, we all realize that. But we also cannot sit idly by and do nothing, for if there is any central theme to the great religions of the world, it is for each of us to have as our principal objective to reach out to feed the hungry, uphold the poor, and love one another—that is what this hunger issue is all about, and there can be no greater moral imperative for us all.

In view of the severity of this problem, I would like to commend my colleagues Congressman MICKEY LELAND, chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger, and Congressmen HAROLD WOLFE and TED WEISS who have worked with Congressman SILVIO CONTE and Congresswoman MARGE ROUKEMA in crafting a bipartisan bill,

H.R. 1097, to alleviate the suffering in Africa. Through this initiative, we can move toward relieving and eliminating the scourge of hunger that afflicts too many of our fellow men and women.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, as we gather this afternoon millions of people on the African Continent are suffering in the midst of the worst drought of the century. Famine and the diseases fostered by famine are decimating an entire generation of Africans.

Together with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], I have reserved this time today for a special order on the Africa famine. This is an opportunity for Members of this House to express their deep concern for the tragic situation unfolding on the continent of Africa and for the need for timely and sufficient emergency food aid to its many victims.

I would like to use my time to relate some recent experiences of my own.

It certainly is not every day that one feels like crying in the midst of a family grocery shopping trip.

No words can adequately describe the outright sense of mourning that overwhelmed me when, 48 hours after returning from a factfinding trip to Ethiopia, I visited my neighborhood supermarket. My senses and my memory were assaulted by the cornucopia we Americans take for granted.

It was late November, and I had just been transported from the richest nation in the world to the poorest of the poor and back again in less than 1 week. As I stood in that supermarket I experienced severe "culture shock."

Just a few days before, I had been standing in the middle of an Ethiopian refugee camp. At every turn, a child tugged at my skirt, imploring, "Sister, Sister!" I stood helpless in the face of the pleadings of famished mothers and emaciated fathers. The stench of death was everywhere.

The sounds, the smells, and the sights of mass starvation, deprivation and disease jolt one's sensibilities and release emotions long repressed. Such an experience transforms the way one looks at the world, perhaps forever.

This human catastrophe has been vicariously experienced by millions of people around the world as the media have vividly portrayed its gruesome reality in our living rooms. Reams of newsprint and hours of newscasts have seared our souls with the tragic drama unfolding on the African Continent.

All of this gives new meaning to the 17th century words of John Donne: "No man is an island * * * Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

America's humanitarian tradition seems to spring from Donne's words. We answer the query of Cain, "Am I

my brother's keeper?", with a prayerful, "Yes."

Indeed, our country's response to this human catastrophe has been exemplary. At President Reagan's personal insistence, our official efforts have been second to none in the international community. The characteristic generosity of the American people has manifested itself in an outpouring of contributions to the various private voluntary relief agencies.

However, to stem the tide of death and disease more aid, from both the Government and the private sectors, will be required from the United States and the international community over the months and years ahead. Aid knows no politics when the misery of hunger threatens a continent.

Clearly, the need has outpaced our budgeted resources. This crisis has drained our Government's emergency drought and famine relief fund. Emergency feeding operations will be severely hampered if new resources are not available and programmed in the next few weeks. Thus, this Congress must fashion a fast-track and approve an emergency supplemental appropriation.

H.R. 1096 is a bipartisan compromise measure to provide such fast-track assistance. My colleague, Mr. CONTE, at this very moment is working in a markup in the Appropriations Committee to see it that this emergency supplemental comes before the Congress quickly.

While I do have persisting concerns about the aid efforts, I am not worried about Congress' response. We will respond, and we are doing everything possible with concerned colleagues on both the Appropriations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee to ensure that this response is neither a dime short nor a day late.

Were Mr. CONTE here, he would go into an explanation of the details of our compromise. It is a package of \$701 million. It is divided between immediate food aid and nonfood aid of a developmental and refugee and rehabilitative nature.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD the details of H.R. 1096:

FACTSHEET: THE AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1985—H.R. 1096/1097

Food aid, \$526.5 million.

Non-food aid, \$175 million.

Total package: \$701.5 million.

1. EMERGENCY FOOD AID—\$526.5 MILLION

A. Provides \$526.6 million in title II, P.L. 480 assistance. Includes money sufficient for acquisition and transport to port of 1.1 million metric tons of food (@ \$360 per metric ton), with the remainder to be used for internal transportation costs (approx. \$133 million, one-half of such costs).

B. Directs the President to use existing authority to meet remaining need (approx. 200,000 metric tons). Legislation addresses total emergency food aid need for the re-

mainder of FY 1985 at 1.3 million metric tons.

2. DISASTER ASSISTANCE—\$137.5 MILLION

A. \$110 million to be used for relief, rehabilitation, and recovery projects, including providing seeds, farm implements, blankets, clothing, water projects, etc. of the total used for just rehabilitation and recovery projects, not less than 80% shall be provided as grants to PVO's and international organizations in carrying out such projects.

B. Not less than 18% of the total (\$25 million) to be used for emergency health care projects.

C. \$2.5 million is appropriated to increase food aid monitoring and help prevent diversions of assistance. The President is also directed to take any additional steps deemed necessary to ensure that U.S. assistance is provided to those for whom it is intended.

3. REFUGEE ASSISTANCE—\$37.5 MILLION

A. Not less than 54% of this total (\$20 million) is made available for the U.N. Development Program (UNDP) Trust Fund for projects proposed at the Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II). These projects address immediate development needs, primarily agriculture-oriented, created by refugees and displaced persons in famine-affected African countries. These projects are ready for implementation and awaiting funding.

B. The remainder of this total (\$17.5 million) is appropriated for use by the State Department's Bureau of Refugee Programs.

4. MID-YEAR NEEDS ASSESSMENT

A. Not later than June 30, the President is required to report to the Congress with an assessment of the African food and disaster assistance needs for FY 1985, together with a projection of the total funding required to provide an appropriate U.S. contribution toward meeting those needs.

B. If current funding levels are insufficient to meet the desired U.S. commitment, the President is urged to request supplemental funding sufficient to accomplish that purpose.

This bill is closest to the mark in calculating a realistic estimate of the need. We can reasonably assure Congress and the American people that this emergency aid bill will forestall the need for additional emergency legislative actions later this fiscal year.

While I do have persistent concerns about the aid efforts, I am not worried about Congress' response. We will respond and I am doing everything possible, along with my concerned colleagues on the Appropriations and Foreign Affairs Committees, to ensure that this response is neither a dime short nor a day late.

While attention remains riveted primarily on the emergency humanitarian requirements, there are emerging policy concerns of equal importance and more enduring consequence. First among them are the impediments fostered by civil strife and ruthless Government action that are unnecessarily slowing the delivery of food.

In addition to the certified evidence of Ethiopian Government seizure of Western food shipments at the Port of Assab, reports persist of Ethiopian Government attacks on food convoys and refugees. Actions such as these

only underscore the need for the international community to exert more influence over the actions of the Ethiopian Government. Short of withholding food shipments we must use all moral suasion possible to gain the agreement of the Ethiopian Government and other affected groups to ensure safe passage of food aid delivery vehicles and personnel. Clearly, the United Nations and the International Red Cross could supervise these deliveries in a neutral manner.

Safe passage would be a major humanitarian breakthrough in the improvement of food delivery to those in dire need as well as a means to reduce the costs of transportation which are rapidly becoming prohibitive.

I am not suggesting that we seek to intervene in the domestic politics of a sovereign nation. However, our food aid must not be used as a political weapon. At present, the full weight of the international community has not been brought to bear on the Government of Ethiopia. For example, the United States should call upon the Soviet Union, which thus far has been recalcitrant, and the United Nations, which has been less than diligent in this area, to use all diplomatic means possible on behalf of the suffering millions. The United States should lead by bringing the bright spotlight of world opinion on the Ethiopians and the Soviets to obtain their cooperation.

By agreeing to safe passage, the Ethiopian Government could move to restore a measure of goodwill in the world community and gain credibility for its resettlement program which is falling far short of its targets in restoring the nation's agricultural economy.

Accommodation in this vital area would also establish a foundation for future cooperative long-term development aid, which is essential if Ethiopia is to become economically viable. Continued dependency on short-term emergency relief erodes its economic and agricultural base, degrades its ability to become self-sufficient and relegates the nation to a state of eternal hand-to-mouth existence.

Indeed, not only Ethiopia, but all of sub-Saharan Africa is in such jeopardy. We must look beyond today's humanitarian imperative. We who have eyes to see and ears to hear observe the political, strategic, and economic importance of the continent and its population. If these millions are impoverished they hold the seeds of a future harvest of continued political and social unrest and threaten the vital geopolitical and strategic concerns of the West.

Therefore, it becomes even more important that we bring the benefits of a new "Green Revolution" to Africa. The United States has traditionally supported African development

through the transfer of agricultural technology and aid assistance. Indeed, our participation in the World Bank's International Development Association and the United Nations World Food Program, International Fund for Agricultural Development and the Food and Agriculture Organization, has created many local success stories. These programs remain crucial if the momentum of agricultural innovation is to continue.

However, without fundamental changes in the agricultural, economic, and population policies of the various African governments, the seeds of progress sown by agricultural innovation will fail to flower. We must work to change the ill-conceived and regressive perceptions of governments that view agriculture as the primitive sector of their economies to be tolerated and taxed solely for the benefit of the urban and industrial sectors. Only when this antiagricultural mindset of postcolonial Africa changes, can genuine progress be made toward the elimination of the conditions that foster these catastrophic famines.

Historically, America's abundant resources and moral leadership have been the world's fortress against hunger. American political and economic innovation provides a beacon lighting a brighter future for a dark continent and the only response to John Donne's admonition "Do not ask for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to compliment the gentlewoman from New Jersey for an outstanding piece of work and leadership on her trip to Ethiopia and her leadership in initiating the compromise and working with our Appropriations Committee in respect to assistance to not only Ethiopia but Africa itself and other countries.

I had the occasion to travel to Africa during the first Reagan years and, in fact, had a protocol on the Republican side and had an opportunity and the honor to meet African leaders in respect to Rhodesia, Tanzania, Somalia, and some of the other countries, and witnessed on our tour with our congressional delegation, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee at that time, the famine and the concerns that we had as a nation, the leader of the free world, in respect to assisting our colleagues in Africa as well as other countries aside from Ethiopia.

I am today in the well to address a specific issue which I am excited about. A group in our congressional district, along with the University of Michigan, private, high-tech people, have come to me and asked me to take

a look at what we call remote sensing devices, in which we can track water tables and look at some high technology in a country like Africa and Ethiopia to assist that nation, through our Agency for International Development, under the leadership of Peter McPherson, who is a Michigan man himself, and I have recommended to AID that they take a look at our proposal on this sensing high-tech project in recommending to the subcommittee and not the supplemental that is being marked up at this hour, as you nicely mentioned today, but for the full foreign aid appropriation bill that will be subsequently before the subcommittee and full committee later in the spring and summer, in which we will present testimony looking at this project in order to assist developing a long-term solution to this crisis rather than just spending dollars, a quick fix, which is important, nevertheless, and I support the appropriation effort and your leadership, but I want to be very careful in saying constructively, in developing public policy, that we ought to look at the long-range problem of not just this famine but subsequent famines, because the history of Africa is very clear, because of population problems and the movement of tribes and individuals, nomads, and the arrangement of the land itself and the terrain and the seasonal climate that they have to deal with, that it is not just an economic or political problem, in the sense of who is in the government and has power, in terms of refugees and the governmental conflicts that are now existing in various provinces, but more importantly I think the long-term concern that I have is addressing a solution that we could constructively help, through our appropriation process in the Congress and the leadership of the gentlewoman from New Jersey, to find a long-term solution to a problem that is critical for Africa and maybe other parts of the world.

I just wanted to briefly outline that proposal. One of the most promising avenues of assistance is to use America's technological leadership to help African nations find new sources of water.

I am supporting the famine prevention project being organized by a group of our leading companies in the field of remote sensing technology. They propose to use their instruments and analytical skills to detect potential underground water sources.

Now, how does remote sensing work and how can it be of help?

Working much as oil companies do to find drilling sites, these scientists can use various satellites and airplanes to analyze oil and determine the most likely places to find water.

Maybe this is potentially helpful in the West and to some of our southern colleagues who are having water shortages, rather than trying to attempt

any water diversion from the Great Lakes.

Anyway, an analysis of surface temperature variations is the most promising method of detecting possible water reservoirs.

Other techniques include patterns of vegetation, soil composition and surface features which may indicate hidden water deposits.

I reemphasize that: Hidden water deposits that are in and have been located, to some extent, in Africa, by previous remote sensing technologies. But I want to emphasize that it has not been intensive enough to really constructively integrate the technology into the government and the private sector and the public sector, through our AID organization, as well as the leaders of Ethiopia and other countries.

So if enough water can be found and developed, it might be possible to break the cycle of drought and famine in Africa.

I propose the following: That leaders of the famine prevention project be allowed to testify before the appropriate congressional committees on their long-range proposal.

I will invite them, through the subcommittee chaired by DAVID OBEY, and Representative JACK KEMP, of our subcommittee, to make that presentation during our congressional hearing.

Next, that Congress consider alternatives to encourage long-range plans to prevent drought and famine.

That one plan that we could do would be to earmark a portion of our relief dollars. As a fiscal conservative, I suggest that we do not always have to add money. We can take the existing appropriation and use earmarked funds and set aside some dollars for a high-tech project. We could do that in order to bring about this high-tech project, in terms of our long-range solution, and that such proposals would not involve new spending, to any extent; that we would agree on a fixed figure, as you have in the compromise, that we would keep it within the framework of those dollars, because of the deficit and what we want to do to achieve a balanced budget in this nation, along with trying to help our fellow brothers.

In the course of my work in the Appropriations Committee, I visited Africa, of course, as I indicated, and I think a project like this deserves some attention by the subcommittee. I will offer that leadership with your help and with the Members and colleagues who are speaking today who have an intensified, sincere effort to lead this nation to the support of any long-term solution as well as the short-term problems that now exist in Africa.

□ 1350

I remember my former superintendent of schools, Russell Isbister—God

love him—who said to me as a young man when I was a county commissioner that "We are not our brother's keeper; we are our brother's brother."

I think that is important to remember here, that as a leader of the free world we act not just in our self-interest but act to help the free world so that we can make a major contribution in solving the long-term problems of famine. That is a constructive policy I would like to help provide with your leadership on this project.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his focus of attention the next step, which is, of course, long-term development if we are to keep these tragic nations from living a hand-to-mouth existence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], who as a member of the Select Committee on Hunger accompanied us on the trip to Ethiopia.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey to yield first briefly to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I wish to just take a moment to say that I have listened to the dialog and salute the gentlewoman from New Jersey for what she is doing. I want her to know that she can certainly count on my support.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues to discuss the famine in Africa, particularly in Ethiopia, and I compliment the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] for her leadership in giving us this opportunity.

As a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, I traveled with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] and other colleagues to Ethiopia in November 1984. During that trip the select committee toured relief camps for famine victims and met with United States and Ethiopian Government officials, as well as the private voluntary organizations providing relief efforts. As you may be aware, about 10 million people are at risk due to the drought, and thousands have already died.

The select committee found some progress in several areas. When we arrived on November 24, there was a great concern over a possible shortfall in food supplies from December through mid-January. While we were there, the chairman, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and our delegation

cabled the AID Administrator, Mr. McPherson, and our President to request that an additional 10,000 metric tons of fortified foods be sent to Ethiopia to help cover this projected deficit. AID was able to divert a ship that was bound for India, got it pointed out of the Indian Ocean and into the Red Sea. At the same time, large new commitments were finalized by the World Food Program and other Western donors which will fill this gap. In addition, the administration announced its intention to tap the International Wheat Reserve, thereby freeing up 300,000 tons of additional source of disaster assistance for Africa.

The logistics of transportation and distribution in Ethiopia seem to have improved somewhat. The Ethiopian Government has increased its capacity to handle shipments coming into the ports and then transporting them to feeding centers around the country. These shipments are being processed faster at the docks, and more trucks are now available. Assessments are being made of how to improve the transportation and distribution systems when increased shipments arrive in 1985.

We closely explored the question of whether our aid was in fact reaching those in need and not being diverted. The private voluntary organizations assured us that the food provided by the United States was being distributed properly. The Agency for International Development has expanded its operations in the country.

Administrator McPherson has directed the placement of AID field personnel, and they are stationed at the American Embassy, working in conjunction with the Ethiopian Government's relief and rehabilitation commission. AID has monitors to constantly check on the distribution of food shipments.

During our visit we met with a number of Ethiopian officials, including Chairman Mengistu. We exchanged frank opinions on the need for improved government-to-government relations. In December 1984, the congressional delegation met with President Reagan to report to him on the situation as we witnessed it. We stressed that the United States can be proud of its response to this human catastrophe.

The food assistance is beginning to alleviate the crisis, but more will be needed from the United States and the international community, and certainly from the private groups who are doing such a splendid job there.

According to AID reports, over 900,000 metric tons of emergency food aid have been provided to sub-Saharan Africa by the United States. This figure is over and above the regular Public Law 480 food Programs. The total U.S. contribution to sub-Saharan Africa, approved so far for fiscal year

1985, is 1.9 million metric tons valued at \$603 million.

Private donations have increased as well. According to Interaction, the American Council for Voluntary International Action, the 15 major relief agencies operating in Ethiopia have received \$60 million for relief efforts in that country.

There is no question in my mind as to the need for additional aid for Ethiopia and the other African countries affected by the famine. However, I want to stress the need for caution and accurate assessments of both the extent of the need and the ability of the governments and other organizations within the famine-affected countries to absorb the donated food and to contribute toward a reversal of the factors at the root of the problem.

Correction of the problem of Africa's shortage of food will come by encouraging African farmers to produce more food by modern techniques and by increasing the ability of the poor to purchase these products.

Several of the policies of the governments in question act as a disincentive for domestic food production and inhibit such food production, private sector activities encouraging economic growth are not adequate, and insufficient attention is given to basic human needs such as education and training.

So our attention today is focused on the emergency need in Africa. It is there, and the United States has been and will continue to be a most generous contributor of aid. It is my hope that we will also be able to contribute to the permanent reversal of the causes of the famine-related problem in sub-Saharan Africa.

I have said many times in reports that I have given in and around my district since we have returned from Ethiopia that you really cannot verbally describe the situation there. A lot of pictures were taken, and as I look back on those pictures, they do not really reveal the whole story. This situation is something you really have to see, touch, feel, smell, and hear to grasp the dimensions of it.

I think that we came back from Ethiopia with a lot of impressions that will be with us forever. But one of the most compelling impressions on me was the fact that the country, at least the famine area to which we traveled, is lacking in an infrastructure, and I do not think that problems of that sort can be overcome overnight. It is not that we and other humanitarian nations of the Western World cannot provide the famine relief. The question is, how much really, given the logistical limitations, can they absorb?

I think, as we address this problem this year, we have to be very careful in our assessment of that factor. I also think, in terms of the actions that the U.S. Government may take, that we have got to be very careful to not give

the impression to the rest of the world and certainly to our own citizens that the United States is going to wave a magic wand and everything is going to be all right. I think that we have got to do what we need to do, and I think AID is in the best position to assess what we should do and what we can do, but I think we should not let the rest of the Western World off the hook.

□ 1400

I think they, too, have an obligation to participate with us in relieving this tragic situation.

Finally, I want to say that I do not want our Government to do anything that is going to diminish the efforts of the private relief organizations that are doing such a magnificent job here. These organizations have the expertise to sensitively administer humanitarian aid. They are the real experts in the field. We know that over \$60 million has been contributed in recent months through private sources, so we do not want to give the impression that the U.S. Government is going to handle the whole thing, because I think some of the best efforts that are taking place there are those that are being made by the private relief agencies, such as Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Services, World Vision, Bread to the World, and many other church groups and private organizations. We really need to encourage them and we need to encourage our own citizens to participate directly.

I think one of the things the gentlewoman and I are glad to be able to give some assurances on, because we had the assurances from the organizations that are operating there, is that money contributed by our constituents for famine relief actually goes for famine relief and that the administrative costs are handled in some other manner, but they do not come out of the direct contributions that our people are making.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

I want to stress two points that the gentleman made. One is the world contribution. We have set as our historic portion of the contribution for humanitarian aid a 50-percent level and that is consistent with what I think it should be.

Mr. McPherson, our AID Administrator, has already set up, and I believe it is in May, I am not sure about the date, but he has set up a conference in Europe of donor nations to assure precisely that the other industrialized countries in the European Common Market and Japan will do their fair share and we should stick to that proposal.

Second, I want to endorse everything the gentleman from Missouri said about the private voluntary organizations. They have a proven record of aid going directly to the people. They know how to work in these countries. They know how to assure deliveries and they are our best hope and they are the agencies through whom we should be directing our assistance. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congresswoman ROUKEMA and Congressman CONTE for reserving this time and join my colleagues in expressing my concern over the famine that is affecting millions of lives throughout sub-Saharan Africa. At the same time, I commend the Agency for International Development for the relief work it has done since the beginning of fiscal year 1985. The United States has already far surpassed the record amount of food aid that was donated in fiscal year 1984.

The African famine is not a recent development; rather it has been building for a number of years. In November 1983, I served as the congressional adviser to the World Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization, an agency of the United Nations. At that conference, the issue which received the most attention was the drought in Africa and the severe famine which was a result of that drought. In a land such as Africa, which has few resources even in normal circumstances, this is particularly devastating.

When I returned to the United States, I committed myself to do whatever I could to ensure that our Government responded in a timely and effective manner.

Although a few Members of Congress were aware of the situation in Africa at that time and actively involved, the issue had not yet caught the attention of the public in general. Just 1 year ago, on February 21, 1984, I joined five of my colleagues at a press conference which was held to draw attention to the famine in Africa and the need for passage of a supplemental appropriation in order to continue U.S. food aid to those starving there. Eventually, the supplemental was passed, but the famine quickly faded from the minds of most people, both here on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

Now, thanks to extensive media attention, the famine in Africa and particularly Ethiopia, is an issue that has remained at the forefront of American concern for several months. Once people saw the extent of a famine which has placed millions on the brink of disaster, Americans responded by opening their hearts and their pocketbooks. They have contributed over \$60 million of their private funds and are

calling upon us to ensure a continued response by the U.S. Government.

Unfortunately, this year, as last, we are facing a crisis in the level of funds remaining in our Food Aid Program. AID has done a remarkable job in obtaining funds from any possible source but funds for this fiscal year will soon run out. Several weeks ago, a deadline of March 1 was given as the date on which, without additional funding, our Food Aid Program would be interrupted. That date is approaching all too quickly.

Last year, the House Appropriations Committee moved in a few hours to approve \$150 million of additional food aid. I urge them to act as quickly this year. The original supplemental last year was held up for months as funding for more and more programs was added to it. That cannot happen again this year. If anything, the situation is even more critical.

As you know, various proposals for food and nonfood aid for Africa ranging from \$235 million to almost \$1 billion have been offered. I am confident that the United States will continue to contribute at least its fair amount to the African relief effort. Traditionally, our share has been one-half of all donations. In fact, that is the goal of the various legislation which has been offered.

Timely passage of a supplemental appropriation is as important as the amount contained in the supplemental. I hope we can all work together to accomplish our goal of continued assistance to those in Africa who are in desperate need. The entire Nation is now familiar with what is at stake and we must act quickly to avert further tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make some further comments on the package that the gentlewoman has put together, which I think should be noted.

Emergency food aid in the package that is now being deliberated would amount to some \$526 million. We should understand that of that amount, \$133 million will be expended just to transport overland the food that this country is sending, so when we talk about dollars, we must remember that the dollars that we are spending are not merely to purchase food aid. We have in that wonderful package \$137 million for disaster assistance to be used for such things as relief, rehabilitation, seeds, farm implements, blankets, clothing, and water projects.

One figure that does not seem to be a very sizable figure, but I think one of the most important elements of the package, is that \$2.5 million is appropriated for the monitoring of the transportation to be sure that the food gets where it is supposed to get and to prevent diversions of assistance. I understand that funding will be used to hire additional AID personnel.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this country is responding in a responsible manner and we are doing more than our fair share, which is the history of this great Nation.

I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

First of all, I want to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from New Jersey for taking this special order to focus on this really very critical, critical problem, and, second, to give her full commendation and credit for the role that she has played in helping to forge a bipartisan compromise over the course of these past months which will result hopefully in the early part of next week in a very significant African famine relief bill going through the House of Representatives, hopefully to be followed almost immediately by action in the Senate.

Yesterday, the better part of the day was spent with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], myself, and the chairman of the Africa Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], and all of our staffs appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriation Committee's two subcommittees dealing with this matter. The remarkable thing is that this was an issue which really had no partisan politics involved in it whatsoever. We came before the committee with a package agreed upon between Members of both parties. Because of the kind of presentation the gentlewoman was able to make with us at the same time, there was just no question but that there was a united effort in this House to get the relief to the people who are on the verge of starving, far too many who have already starved, and because of the gentlewoman's efforts, combined with others, I think we have seen the kind of rapid action in this House which is not often seen. So I want to give her full credit for the role that she has played and hopefully we will be able to join together and undertake efforts of this kind in the future for the well-being and betterment of humanity, whether in this country or elsewhere.

Again, my very, very sincere thanks to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Well, the gentleman is very kind, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], but I think equal if not more credit goes to the gentleman from New York and his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] on the Foreign Affairs Committee for the initiative and

actions of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman has been discussing this problem for months, if not years, and to a large extent, the actions we are now seeing are the cumulative results of the gentleman's efforts and I thank him for his help.

Mr. WEISS. I thank the gentlewoman so much.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

□ 1410

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take a great deal of time here this afternoon; I think there is so much that has been adequately said already. I do think that I must join, however, with everyone else in a special commendation to the lady from New Jersey for her leadership and efforts in this regard.

It is so easy for all of us to become involved and committed from an emotional perspective to what we have seen on the evening news. I think, however, it is a much different thing to try to develop that emotion and channel it into a rational and proper public policy in the real world in which we live, and I think you've tried to do that, and have done it successfully, and I mean that sincerely.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just make three comments outside of my remarks I am going to submit for the record.

My first and foremost needs to be re-emphasized, from the distinguished Prime Minister this morning, when she talked about Africa and its famine, and who was providing aid and who was not; we had better not lose sight of the fact that the United States alone is committing up to 50 percent of the food relief needs in the entire continent, and when you add the other countries of the West, I think quickly we recognize in the great East-West dialog and competition of ideas and ideology we have, who really is committed to helping people; who is committed to sending arms.

The second point that I want to make is a point which I hope this Congress can consider from an aside, outside of this issue—but I think this issue has very great significance and lessons for us all to learn.

Clearly, Africa is in the problems it is today because of drought. But let us not underestimate that many of their problems are also because of mismanagement of farm programs and inadequate government policies.

As we go forth with the development of a farm bill in dealing with our own agricultural problems in this country, I hope we will keep that in mind and never lose sight of our need for a food policy in the United States.

The third thing I want to bring up is something that I think is important

when we deal with famine relief. It is easy to talk about the need for economic assistance to provide the food and the transportation. When we talk, as they have earlier today about the \$160 million, I believe it is for transportation, then I think we have to ask ourselves the question of, how do we provide that food? Not just, do we provide dollars but how can we best do it?

I would like to suggest that the United States has a unique role there, and I would hope that our AID people, that our Department of Agriculture and others would recognize that as we channel our Public Law 480 money and programs into this, we, in the United States, have a very special task, not only to provide the cereals—I am all for providing the cereals—but equally important, to provide the processed, fortified food.

If you will take a look at any of the studies or, as our colleague from New Jersey and others have done, to visit these camps, you will find that most of the people who tread over miles and miles to get to a food camp arrive there very malnourished, very sick as a result of this; they are in need of concentrated doses of high protein, of high calorie supplemental food.

Second, I think when you look at the scarcity of the food cooking materials, what we need to do is provide some type of food which, with a minimum of cooking, with a minimum of water, with the minimum of preparation will be able to provide that particular protein substance that is so essential.

Third, when we look at countries such as Ethiopia with their problems in transportation; their security problems due to the civil war, their rugged terrain, et cetera, I think then it becomes incumbent upon us as we recognize the difficulties in keeping that food chain open that we put a special emphasis from the U.S. perspective in providing high protein, high calorie food commodities which will give the most nutrition per pound of food that is transported.

Now why do I say all this? I say it because the United States, unlike any of the other countries providing food assistance to Africa, has a special opportunity in that we have the processed foods. Most of these countries cannot do that; they can only provide the cereals in their basic forms.

We produce, through our Public Law 480 program, the processed foods, and I would hope that as we go forth with this, we do not only provide the dollars; we do not only provide the transportation but we also take the leadership in how those dollars, how that food is provided that is of the most benefit to the people in the area.

Again, I want to commend the lady for her work, and I commend to her colleagues who are listening and to the American public as we debate this special supplemental and as we try to

move forth, let us deal with a rational public policy perspective and not just the emotions, because I think they have succeeded in bridging and uniting those two concerns.

Mr. Speaker, the world is faced with a catastrophic disaster in Africa to an extent that both immediate short-term and extensive long-term responses are required from the community of nations. But it is the United States which is uniquely qualified to respond to this drought and famine which has devastated much of the African continent.

The bleak facts have been presented on the front pages and covers of our major newspapers and magazines, and brought right into our homes by the evening news, yet they bear repeating. Twenty countries are experiencing food shortages resulting from 3 years of drought, and widespread death is occurring in a number of these. The total food deficit for these nations for the 1984-85 crop year is estimated by the United Nations at 6.8 million metric tons of cereal grain; the drought is estimated to affect some 150 million people.

Unquestionably, these facts dictate that an immediate short-term response to the hunger problem be undertaken by the world. Clearly, large quantities of food and nonfood assistance are required.

I recently had the opportunity to discuss the famine with Mr. John Wise, a representative of a Wisconsin milling firm, who had gone to Africa to view conditions firsthand. Mr. Wise concluded that the United States opportunity and ability to respond to the famine is unique. Frankly, ours is one of the few countries in the world with the food surpluses and ability to produce enriched foods which these starving Africans can consume. In addition, the demand for these enriched commodities is increased by the circumstances of the drought and famine.

In Ethiopia for example, the people arrive in food camps after walking as much as 30 miles and, as such, in extremely malnourished condition. The scarcity of fuel and water for cooking also necessitates food with minimal preparation requirements. Finally, small children are particularly vulnerable to malnutrition and disease caused by famine and thus require highly nutritious foods.

It is our enriched foods which can quickly respond to these needs. The efficiency of American agriculture provides the raw materials for foods such as CSM—a corn, soy, and dry milk mixture—which is high in protein and of high caloric content. And our Government already has a range of these foods available for aid through the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Program.

The sponsors of today's special order, and concurrently the sponsors of H.R. 606, are to be commended for their prompt response to the immediate famine problems we confront in Africa. While the original bill would provide a \$628 million supplemental, it is my understanding that the Foreign Affairs Committee has reported an amended version, supported by Representative ROUKEMA and Representative CONTE, providing \$701 million in total assistance. The increase has been provided to cover higher transportation costs as determined by the Agency for International Development.

This supplemental is important because it will meet the American objective of providing 50 percent of the nearly 3.9 million metric ton food aid needs of the famine nations. The legislation is complete in that it also provides \$175 million for nonfood relief assistance such as emergency shelter, medical care, and refugee programs.

Clearly, the passage of authorizations and appropriations for this supplemental aid is a near-term priority for Congress and the starving people of Africa. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Finally, we must also consider the long-term problems which will continue to face the African Continent. We must, in the future, address the system and deficiencies of African agriculture which have permitted this famine to occur. If we do not do so in a manner which will allow Africa to provide itself, supplementals such as this may confront us again and again.

For now, what we are doing is necessary and the least we can be asked. Already our Government's response, through steps taken by the administration, has been generous. We should now meet our further responsibilities by completing our obligations to world society and the people of Africa.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank my colleague from Wisconsin, and I would like to point out, of course, that as you know, this year we will, the Congress will be addressing the question of reauthorization of the Public Law 480 program in the farm bill; that will be a unique opportunity to address some of these very valid concerns of yours.

Also, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs we will be reauthorizing a foreign operations bill which also can be the vehicle for addressing these real problems of infrastructure, agricultural and economic innovation, development innovation that America is so uniquely in a position to provide for Africa, and create another green revolution for the continent of Africa so that we will not have these persistent cycles of famine and devastation.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Just a quick comment in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who looks at hunger anywhere in the world will

quickly discover you will never solve the hunger problems until you solve the poverty problem, on any type of long-term basis. So I think it is a good point to bring out in this debate.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I now recognize my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too want to join my colleagues in commending the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her leadership. I think the comments today have been excellent. Mine will support those of Mr. PURSELL in a slightly expanded way.

Mr. Speaker, 150 million people in Africa, the world's least developed are affected by chronic food shortages. In Ethiopia, 6 to 10 million people are directly affected by the current famine. Almost all of rural black Africa is starving.

The severe drought is the latest and most visible exacerbation in Africa's long history of failing to provide food for its swelling population. The United States must help starving Africans, but must also seek long-term solutions to the African's situation at the same time. Paradoxically, one of the answers lies in preserving life, which will have the long-term effect of reducing the population growth.

Black Africa is the world's poorest region; 29 of the world's 36 poorest nations are in sub-Saharan Africa. All are in desperate need of both immediate and long-term survival assistance; 9 of every 10 people live in absolute poverty in the rural areas. They have the highest population growth rates, and face the most severe environmental problems in the world. Most of the adults will not live past 40 years, and they know they will lose half of all their children to disease and malnutrition.

According to Dr. Lewis Thomas, the eminent medical researcher—

Two-thirds of the world population's disease problems in the underdeveloped countries are, in part, the result of poverty and malnutrition, which are in part due to overpopulation. But the problem reverses itself, the overpopulation is in part due to disease, poverty, and malnutrition. It is not one problem; it is a system of problems, and to change the system without making matters worse will not be easy. But to decide to let matters stay as they are and let nature continue to take its course would create the setting for future events that would be politically as well as morally unacceptable.

Chronic illness—disease—is the most serious problem in Africa. And, it is a well-known fact that most chronic illness in Africa—and other developing countries—is related in one way or another to contaminated water supplies and poor sanitary environment. Because of its scarcity, water has always been Africa's most precious commodity. However, most of Africa's water is contaminated with human feces and is the greatest cause of debilitating disease, along with malaria and malnutri-

tion. Humans, animals, food supplies—all potentials are either diminished or extinguished by contaminated, unsafe water.

Few changes or other forms of assistance would benefit the health and productivity of Africa as dramatically as sufficient supplies of safe water and hygienic methods of sanitation to control water-related disease. Control of disease that is preventing the people from realizing their potential would lead to control of the population growth rate and the stabilization of Africa itself. How so? Child survival would slow down the birth rate. Keeping children now living alive would eliminate the need for their replacement. Parents who expect their children to die, inadvertently force the population growth rate upward by giving birth to more children than they want, to replace their losses. On the other hand, if parents know that their children are more likely to live, then they will give birth to fewer children. Already, 7 countries in the developing world have reduced their infant death rates and birth rates. According to UNICEF's 1985 report—

If every developing nation had infant death rates and birth rates as low as Sri Lanka's, there would be 7.5 million fewer child deaths each year, and 35 million fewer births.

Once freed from the hazards and uncertainties of disease and overchildbearing, parents can be in control of their situation and future.

Black Africa is the only region in the world where the population is growing faster than food supply. The rural economy of rural black Africa has traditionally favored and dictated large families to ensure assistance and family survival. There is an old African saying, "Plenty kids, plenty poverty." But because half of all the children die in infancy or early childhood from disease and malnutrition, custom-bound parents accordingly must produce as many more children as early as they can. To ensure their heritage, many African women, often merely children themselves, impoverished and malnourished, give birth to too many children too close together, reinforcing the poverty-population cycle.

Chronic poor health and high mortality caused by water-borne disease have taken a high toll in African lives and suffering. Parasitic, infectious, and communicable diseases historically have undermined the health and capability of the poor to subdue and control their environment. The most common and severe disease, malaria and diarrheal infections, kill more than 1 million African children every year. Malaria, sleeping sickness and bilharzia—worm-infestations—together affect more than 200 million Africans, causing chronic invalidism and

high mortality. Because of the loss of energy and vitality, most of the people are reduced to a listless struggle for mere survival. Control of a single disease, infectious diarrhea, alone would save the lives of hundreds of thousands of children every year and help to bring down the birth rate.

At one time, in our country, we had to worry about dying prematurely or suffering for life from many of the same diseases that are killing most people in Africa and other parts of the developing world. Again quoting from Dr. Thomas—

The contamination of water by human feces was at one time the greatest single cause of human disease and death for most of us and remains so along with malnutrition and malaria for the 3rd world. However, much of the credit for our good health today goes to the sanitary engineers and plumbers and not to the presence of the medical profession. Only when the plumbers and the sanitary engineers completed their work in the construction of our cities in the early years of the 19th century did typhoid fever, cholera and dysentery—the chief threats to survival—begin to vanish. And you can be sure that if we went back to the old ways of finding water to drink, those diseases would reappear.

In just 15 years the African population will have doubled, and 80 African towns will each have more than 1 million people. That future population will have no more of a chance for survival and progress without modern methods of water purification than do the people of today. We will see the doubling of all the present problems that are concomitant with population growth if we do not act now to stabilize population growth with modern methods of water purification. Africa's permanent recovery is contingent upon safe water to sustain a healthy people and their environment.

This is a crucial point in Africa's long-delayed development. What we do for that country now, we do for ourselves and the world. Tropical deforestation is extinguishing ecosystems upon which other systems are dependent, perhaps causing global climatic changes. The effects of natural disasters, such as the drought, are worsened by poverty, environmental damage, and rapid population growth. Much of the sub-Saharan land has been deforested, due in part to lack of sufficient water, in part to cattle overgrazing, and in part to cutting down of trees for use as fuel. Today 20 percent of Africa is desert, but if land use patterns don't change drastically, 50 percent of Africa will be desert in 50 years. In less than 20 years, Ethiopia's forest covered land area already has been reduced from 16 percent to 3.1 percent.

Vast areas of land to be reforested as quickly as possible in order to maintain ecosystem balance. Reforestation is dependent upon a healthy energetic people and modern methods of water delivery and purification. Upon this

basis the country will continue to exist and progress and play its role in the global ecosystem balance.

We will long wait to see the results of our work in Africa. Although it is the African countries themselves who will have to take the final responsibility for improving the physical and social status of its population, we and our Government and other governments and organizations can work together now to give Africa the basis it needs to restore both reason and hope for successful development.

□ 1420

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank my colleague.

The issue of child health and infant mortality of course is a complex one, but you are quite correct and we are grateful for your including that aspect of the subject in this discussion here today.

I think it is an appropriate time to acknowledge the contribution of our colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger in their efforts last year in seeing to it that a child health and nutrition bill was passed for overseas relief. They were particularly concerned with some of the issues that the gentleman discussed. One of the greatest scourges among children, whether in the starvation category or the malnutrition category is dehydration. The problem of dehydration is high on the death list.

Their bill to the amount of \$50 million is currently being programmed through AID and I think we should all be grateful for their vision last year and for their leadership in seeing to it that Congress addressed this problem. But more obviously needs to be done as the gentleman pointed out.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe the gentleman is referring to the substance that has been created. If you take a dehydrated child and simply administer water, if anything, that exacerbates the problem. But a substance has been developed, the contents of which I do not recall, that upon feeding the child, within hours, regains consciousness if it has been lost, regains vitality, and so forth.

But again it is the short-term solution. It does not ignore, I do not suggest that, but it does beg the question of how do you purify those water supplies so that you avoid that dehydration in the first place.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Well, it is an essential medical adjunct at the current time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Absolutely.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. But it does not address the long-term problem, the fundamental problem.

Mr. CHANDLER. If we can demonstrate to those families that their chil-

dren will survive—in the seven or eight other countries where that has been the case we will, I believe, see population rates decline.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman very much.

Our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has been quite patient. I think he has a visual display to help understand the problem.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman for the leadership she has shown, not only on the committee, but for taking out this special order.

The gentlewoman and I, in addition to her leadership role as the ranking member of the Select Committee on Hunger, does serve on the International Development Organization Subcommittee of the Banking Committee and therefore has that additional valuable perspective.

I was preparing for a special order myself when I noticed the nature of the gentleman's special order and I thought I would share with my colleagues an experience I had this past week in the district work period in my own district. I visited the Creek Mills in my own district and in the process I watched the preparation of processed grain being loaded for our Public Law 480 programs and specifically for our famine assistance programs in Africa.

We have heard many comments about how our grain is delivered and many sources of misinformation, I think, have been all too prevalent.

I would like to show this 50-pound sack which happens to be delivering in this instance corn sorghum milk. It says: "Furnished by the people of the United States of America. Not to be sold or exchanged."

It has the contract number for quality control and inventory control, plus the distributing private voluntary organization, in this case CARE.

□ 1430

Now, if you take a look at the reverse side, you also see the same message in 12 other languages, including those that are commonly used in the continent of Africa. Not only is processed grain being provided, like this corn soya milk, but bulgur wheat, fortified processed wheat, fortified corn, in interesting and relevant combinations.

I would simply like to say that the material that we are providing today in this way comes from the heartland of the United States, from 50 miles from the geographic center of the continental United States.

I watched a traincar being loaded, one of many that day, headed for the Port of Corpus Christi and then for Nigeria. This 50-pound sack I showed you is not a typical sack. It is lined with plastic to be insect resistant, and the material that is provided needs

only the addition of milk or water and it becomes something, frankly, that is more nutritious than the average American schoolchild receives for breakfast at home or school.

It seems to me, after hearing some comments from various sources and seeing some resource material, that indeed we might be well advised to deliver more processed product because it seems to me, from what I have heard, that some of the grain delivered directly is not used well, cannot be used well under certain conditions, depending on the condition of the person to be assisted. Frankly, it is of no parochial interest to me because the grain can come directly from States like my own or the processed grain, but I would hope, and I fully expect, that the Select Committee on Hunger is looking at the proper distribution and allocation of food, be it processed or raw commodities.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank my colleague, and I would like to just briefly summarize two points that I think have been made in one form or another during this special order but I believe bear repeating.

One of those is the fact that we have heard about problems with respect to distribution, problems particularly in Ethiopia, but there may be in other countries, about food diversions, black marketeering and other efforts by local governments to prevent food from being distributed.

With respect, specifically, to the problem in Ethiopia, it is my concern and the concern of many in Congress, I know, that they want to carefully distinguish between essential humanitarian aid which is being delivered, and not let a backlash develop or any hesitancy or withholding of assistance develop because of the unsavory and, in some cases, illegal conduct of the local government.

With respect to this, I do not think, particularly in Ethiopia, that either the United Nations or the U.S. Government has exercised and exerted all influence and moral suasion possible to get the cooperation of the Ethiopian Government for what is known as granting of safe passage for food delivery.

I know that this is the desirable thing to do, but I think, in the absence of the leadership in the United States, and exerted influence by the United Nations, perhaps using the spotlight of public opinion on the Soviet Union, who thus far has been recalcitrant to help in any way in assuring food deliveries within the country of Ethiopia, I think that we must use the spotlight of public opinion to force the Ethiopian Government to grant the United Nations and the International Red Cross their request to guarantee safe passage.

Not only will that assure that food is being delivered but it will also greatly reduce the transportation costs in country and relieve many of us and actually open the pursestrings of many other countries who are skeptical about these food deliveries.

I guess, finally, I must repeat and underscore the need for a long-term look at the needs of Africa to promote a green revolution in Africa. That will require the cooperation and changing of agricultural and economic policies of the African nations themselves, but the United States' ability and innovation, both in agriculture and direct economic aid, as well as through World Bank resources, can provide daylight for the Dark Continent that they have not yet received. It will take a generation, perhaps, but we have no alternative. We do not want Africa to become permanent wards of the world and all of the political and social unrest and volatility that goes with that. It is enlightened self-interest and it is humanitarian need in the best tradition of Donne's admonition: "We are all involved with mankind."

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentlewoman for her excellent leadership and for taking this special order today. Indeed, it is enlightened self-interest. I was trying to provide a few parochial examples of what it means directly in employment in a part of our society, at ports, at processing facilities, and at the production point.

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the world is again witnessing massive hunger and even starvation in Africa—a mere decade after there was similar human tragedy in Ethiopia, Mali, and other parts of the Sahel. Again people of goodwill are responding with compassion to the faces of starvation, even as they are overwhelmed by the ever-increasing projections of the numbers of likely victims.

HISTORIC FACTORS

Africa's current food shortages and economic dependency have roots in the history of its relationship with European nations and the Western Hemisphere. Before Europeans became involved, agriculture was the primary economic activity in Africa. Sophisticated techniques had evolved which were suited to the needs of the people and their fragile environment and which helped them cope with cyclical droughts and crop failures due to other causes. Adequate food, security, and self-reliance were common before European colonialization. Methods had been developed for storage of surpluses and complex patterns of trade had been developed around food availability.

The slave trade, which over a period of nearly 300 years took from Africa many of the most able-bodied men and women—totaling as many as 100 million people—severely disrupted the food producing and storing capacity in

much of the continent. The colonial period which followed further damaged Africa's ability to feed itself.

Colonialism was a system for extracting wealth from the continent; agricultural products were part of this wealth. Colonial powers normally emphasized production which met their needs and tastes, not the needs of the people of Africa. Cash crops were planted for export in order to pay the taxes mandated by the colonial governments. These cash crops frequently displaced food for local consumption.

Colonial powers oversaw the development of roads and railways in Africa. This transportation network, however, was designed to facilitate the flow of material goods between Africa and European nations, not to facilitate the development of Africa. The impact of colonialism on human resources was as profound as on the natural resources and wealth of the African Continent. It created many forms of dependency and it limited human development. The education and training which were provided under colonial rule were usually inadequate or inappropriate to the needs and cultures of the African peoples.

The problems of hunger must be viewed in the context of this history. While it would be an oversimplification to argue that slavery and colonialism are the direct causes of hunger in Africa today, it must be recognized that these factors disrupted old patterns which historically had helped African people cope with periodic crop failures. They have had a lasting influence which has weakened rather than strengthened African capacities to cope with crop failures today.

CURRENT ECONOMIC DEPENDENCY

Economic development as carried out in much of Africa is fueled by the desire for rapid industrialization. Unfortunately, the models which have been adopted have frequently served primarily the interests of a few privileged groups in Africa and the economic interests of Eastern and Western Europe, Japan, the United States, and other industrialized nations. Many of the development plans which are encouraged and financed by these industrialized nations are large in scale and based on high technology. Even when launched with the highest of ideals, these plans frequently fail because the required technical and economic infrastructures do not exist in most African countries.

MILITARISM AND INSTABILITY

Many of the countries of Africa currently facing famine are also involved in wars, civil strife, or threats to their stability and security. Mozambique, one of the countries most hard hit by the current drought and food shortage, is at the same time confronted with South African-backed guerrilla forces which are wreaking havoc on

the nation's economy and infrastructure. Ethiopia has been involved in military conflict for many years with Somalia and with separatist or autonomist movements in Eritrea and Tigray. Chad's civil strife has been exacerbated by military intervention from Libya and France.

The frequent correlation between hunger and military conflict reflects the terrible consequences of militarism and fighting in Africa where cyclical droughts and the negative impact of inappropriate development already make millions of people vulnerable to hunger and starvation. Nations which are involved in military conflict or which face concerted destabilization, end up channeling their already limited national resources into armies and military hardware rather than into the needs of their people. When famine situations develop, military priorities, instability, and insecurity make relief efforts all the more complex, as is now the case in Ethiopia.

A further destructive consequence of militarism in Africa is its relation to foreign debt. Military assistance, whether from East or West, rarely comes without a price. The assistance is often in the form of arms sales for which payment is required, thus deepening foreign debts of African nations to industrialized powers.

FAMINE AND DEVELOPMENT

Recurrent famine in many parts of Africa must be addressed through wise development plans. This much is clear. Less clear is the precise nature which will be most effective for development. Plans must consider the issues noted.

First, many African nations will need long-term development assistance from the industrialized and more affluent nations of the world for many years. It should be provided in a way which is sensitive to the needs and particularities of the individual nations. The assistance should be provided at a scale which allows community participation in planning and implementation and as a technologic level which is appropriate to community needs and capacities. A fundamental aim of long-term assistance should be food self-reliance for the millions of African women and men who are now dependent on imported food.

Second, effective strategies for economic development and food production will require recognition of the particular historic economic role of women. Aid programs and governments must involve men and women in planning and implementing development programs.

Third, new international financial arrangements must be devised which free debtor countries from the requirements of export of crops and minerals as their primary role in the international economy.

Fourth, the United States, the Soviet Union, and all nations must recognize the legitimacy of African nations choosing their own economic and political systems to meet the needs of their people.

Fifth, the nations of Africa ultimately are responsible for finding solutions to the military conflicts on the continent. Nonetheless, the industrialized powers have the responsibility to abstain from outside manipulation and escalation of local conflicts and from placing them in the framework of the cold war or other international conflict. They must further refrain from arms sales which deepen foreign debts and make local conflicts more lethal. The United States and Western European nations must use their considerable leverage to stop the destabilizing efforts and military intervention of South Africa in the southern portion of the continent. Only when the people of Africa are freed from the suffering caused by war and the distorting effects of militarism on their countries will the necessary resources, energy, and commitment be devoted to development of economic systems which meet the needs of people.

Much of the developmental assistance characterized by high technology, whether from socialist or capitalist industrialized nations, has resulted in severe vulnerability to oil price inflation. This consequence has been a significant factor in the large scale debt of many African countries and in their increasing dependence on industrialized nations. Their debts to private banks and international lending agencies, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, rival the more publicized debts of Mexico and Brazil on a per capita basis. Yet, because of their weaker economies and smaller populations, the absolute amounts of their debts do not pose a threat to the international financial system. The countries of Africa, therefore, do not have the leverage of larger debtor nations to negotiate terms of repayment.

In this modern context, the cash crop system remains a reality in much of Africa. Agricultural exports are the primary source of foreign exchange, and little of the balance is used to better the conditions of the majority of African people who are rural and poor.

The International Monetary Fund imposes numerous conditions on debtor nations in order to assure they meet their obligations; the conditions must be met if new loans are to be secured or old debts are to be rescheduled or refinanced. These conditions frequently include requirements that the debtor nations export products and reduce imports in order to gain foreign currency, requirements that they devalue their currencies, and requirements for other changes in the

management of their economies. Similar conditions for economic and developmental assistance to Third World countries are now being established by the U.S. Government.

Many countries of Africa, regardless of political orientation or alliance, have thus lost or are losing control over their own economies. The pressure to export tends to exacerbate the problems of economies which in many cases were already distorted and which have traditionally provided raw materials to the rest of the world. As many African nations are required further to emphasize production and development of their resources for export, they are increasingly placed in the position of having to import basic necessities for their own people.

POVERTY AND PEOPLE

Rarely do middle class and wealthy people go hungry in the countries experiencing drought or famine. Food is usually available to those with money. It is the poor—and usually those in rural areas—who go hungry; indeed, even in normal times they often exist on the margins of national economies.

Although the current famine is rooted in the past and nourished by current power struggles, the problem must be addressed now—before we can deal with the complex underlying factors. Hunger is curable. Food is the immediate solution, and we must begin to provide the vast quantity of emergency food relief which is needed.

Once emergency relief has begun, we must address the more basic causes of famine in Africa and other parts of the world. This will require that we not use other nations as our surrogates in power struggles. It will require that we not hold nations hostage to indebtedness which forces them to grow export crops while ignoring domestic needs. It requires that we recognize that we share this world and its resources fairly with others. It requires that we become a good neighbor to all nations.

America has met many challenges. It can meet the challenge of limited resources in a world that seems ever closer. ●

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, we are all facing a grim situation: that of millions of human beings who are about to die of continued starvation in Africa.

There has been little rain in recent years, none in many regions, too much fighting among insurgents and dictators who usurp the right to make such life-or-death decisions without advice or guidance, lack of international training, assistance, helping to build wells and roads and other dire causes.

Nevertheless millions have already died and millions more will die, while the world is spending over \$1 trillion in 1985 on military programs and manpower. Some of that money is neces-

sary to protect one nation from another since no one else will do so for them. Some of it feeds the families of enlisted men and officers and contributes to the lives of those people. But the magnitude of that figure spent on protection when measured against the greatness of our highest ideals and principles of civilized justice and of secular law and when measured against the needs of so many people who can be helped for a few dollars per year until they, too, have the know-how, the health and the stamina to join the productive citizens of this world—when measured against all that, surely we can agree to help and surely we can help effectively for far less money and food otherwise going to waste while ruining the farmer of our own country for lack of buyers.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of a bill, H.R. 100, which seeks to address this problem as adequately as presently seems possible and I urge all of our colleagues to become interested and involved in this matter affecting the basic dignity of human life on our globe.●

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today we are confronting the severe famine which is affecting over 20 African countries. The unprecedented media coverage of this tragedy has brought it to the attention of millions of concerned American citizens. The tragic conditions in Africa seem endless.

In Ethiopia alone 2.5 million people are in life-threatening situations and 150 million Africans are affected by the drought.

Crop levels for 1984 in some areas of Africa are reported to be as much as 40 percent below the already low levels of 1983.

There are reports of starving Africans resorting to eating the seeds intended to be planted this fall, leaving little or none for next year's harvest.

The United States, always a leader in humanitarian assistance to developing countries, once again leads the relief efforts. To date, the United States has been the largest food donor to Africa, contributing more food aid than all the other donors combined.

Yet there is no significant improvement in sight.

We face a problem in Africa of a magnitude that most of us cannot imagine, a problem that will not even begin to be solved until we appreciate its origins. Although a natural disaster of tremendous proportions set into effect the suffering that we are witnessing, we can and must accept the human error that has compounded the tragedy.

Food and emergency aid are absolutely necessary for relief efforts now, but we must also look for long-range policies that will prevent future natural disasters from being worse than they need to be. We can begin by fo-

cusing on assistance that will make effective use of existing natural resources without burdening the people with technologies that require high levels of costly energy.

First, the American public must appreciate that this effort will take time. Solving the problem rather than responding to the crisis requires patience. The initial results of projects aimed at developing small, least-cost energy, high density food plots are extremely encouraging. Ongoing work in Mexico, India, Togo, South Africa, and China are using biointensive methods based on research demonstration that a complete diet can be grown on a plot of 2,800 square feet. This is one-tenth the area required by traditional methods, and one-third of that required on mechanized U.S. farms. This biointensive method of food production can be done with simple hand tools, requires no petrochemical inputs for fertilizers or pesticides, no irrigation systems, or expensive machinery, and consumes only a fraction of the water required in conventional farming. It is truly an appropriate technology for the 1 billion poverty-stricken individuals in developing nations.

I would like for this body to invest greater effort in forward-looking solutions to world hunger, solutions based on self-sufficiency rather than emergency relief. It is time to appreciate the limits of exporting fully developed, energy-intensive technologies to developing, energy-poor nations. It is time to take an aggressive stand by encouraging the use of our development aid for projects that satisfy the needs of small farmers rather than increasing their dependence on expensive fuel. We can do this by creating and implementing a new model of least-cost energy as the starring point for our development programs.

If we are to make progress in ending famine in Africa, then we must encourage the development of agriculture markets that fit the needs and capabilities of the small farmer. We must encourage the growth of food crops rather than cash crops in countries that are not self-sufficient. We must take the responsibility to ensure that the development aid that we provide to African nations is used to promote independence, and not a new cycle of famine and starvation.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives ROUKEMA and CONTE, for organizing this special order on Africa. One can scarcely pick up a newspaper without reading something about the African famine and its effects on individual lives. I know that my constituency, and I'm sure all our constituencies, is particularly disturbed and touched by the enormity of this tragic famine.

I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a report which was

recently released for the Office of Technology Assessment on the African food crisis. The report predicts that the sub-Saharan Africa food situation will continue to decline and that a solution to these problems will only be reached with new approaches and long-term commitment on the part of African nations and those nations assisting them. The OTA report points to the small, subsistence-level farmers and herders as they key to such a solution and warns that this faction, which raises most of Africa's food, has been largely ignored.

I would urge that as we continue the debate and votes on African developmental assistance, in the imminent emergency supplemental as well as in later long-term considerations, that this very interesting report should be taken into serious consideration.●

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues, Mr. CONTE and Mrs. ROUKEMA, for providing this opportunity to address the critical situation that is facing the millions of hungry people in Africa. I compliment their leadership in the continuation of our American philosophy of sharing, caring, and meeting the needs of those less fortunate, not only here at home, but around the world.

We are all keenly aware of the tragic famine that has stricken an estimated 150 million people of the nations of Africa. And this number is growing constantly, as evidenced this year in the loss of thousands of innocent lives in Ethiopia, Sudan, and 18 other African nations.

In this time of immense human suffering, we must not only make expenditures to provide relief, in addition, we need to ensure that the aid that we provide truly reaches the hungry. Many in this Nation and in other countries are working to accelerate grain shipments, provide land vehicles, lend voluntary assistance, and send medical aid to those in desperate need. As Members of Congress, it is our responsibility to facilitate the creative capabilities of private, voluntary organizations, concerned citizens, and the appropriate Government agencies to deal with the current crisis.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Agency for International Development for its fine work in coordinating the African relief effort. But even more impressive is the response of the American people to the African situation. Last December, I helped shovel the first of 1,000 tons of Great Northern beans that were sent by farmers in western Nebraska to contribute to the famine relief effort. The residents of Crete, NE, are sending 50-pound bags of flour to the sub-Saharan, drought-stricken areas.

These are the actions of compassionate, concerned people, who are truly

sacrificing to lend aid to those needing relief. But these same citizens are concerned that the aid we send actually reaches the people that need assistance. Recently, the New York Times reported that perhaps only a third of our aid extends beyond the comparatively well-to-do cities to the tragically malnourished in the more remote areas.

This acute hardship is faced at a time of crisis for our Nation's agricultural community as well, but for much different reasons. Grain is in surplus here in America, waiting to be used by those who most need it. My hope is that we can quickly take action to address both of these crises, partly by sending our plenty to those in Africa—simply put, sending our resources where they are needed.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my concern for the victims of the worst drought and famine in this century. More than 150 million people in at least 28 countries in Africa face famine as a result of this drought. The African crisis has raised public consciousness about the problem of hunger in the world, and underlined the need for an appropriate response by the United States.

The drought has placed 7.7 million people at some risk of starvation, with 2.5 million of those in immediate life-threatening jeopardy. As we know, during the first 3 months of fiscal year 1985 the United States has provided \$348 million to aid victims of the famine. In the past, the United States has provided at least half of the international food aid in emergencies and it is important that we do as much as we can to continue that level of support. We will soon consider an emergency supplemental appropriations bill to provide more aid to those starving in Africa. I believe that it is imperative that this legislation be passed quickly so that the necessary assistance reaches Africa in time to save lives.

Emergency food aid is of unmistakable value to the people of Africa, but it only addresses the most visible part of the dilemma which confronts them. Assistance is needed to store and transport the supplies, medical care must be provided for refugees and other famine victims, and, above all, a long-term program of aid designed to improve agricultural practices and procedures must be implemented. If we do not take these steps, I fear the tragedy of Ethiopia and her sister countries will be repeated often in the future. We have all been touched by the news photos of the starving in Africa and we must certainly do what we can to address their immediate needs. But we must also be prepared to help the nations of Africa begin to do the things necessary to insure that the children of those now driven by hunger far

from their homes do not have the same experience in their lifetimes.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have historically given from their hearts to ease the suffering of people in need in the world. We now have budgetary problems in this country that must be addressed, but we also have an ability to do more in Africa. I urge my colleagues to take the opportunity which soon will be presented by the urgent supplemental appropriations bill to bring relief to those so desperately in need of it, and to be prepared to make the kind of long-term commitment that will hopefully make other emergency measures of this kind unnecessary.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, several months ago when BBC footage of the famine in Ethiopia flashed across the television screens of our Nation, our collective heart went out to a people in utter despair.

When such massive suffering, unbeknownst to most of us was witnessed, Americans responded with a ground swell of compassion and charity. I am sure many of my colleagues became aware as I did, of constituents who decided the best way to celebrate the true spirit of the Christmas/Chanukah season was to forgo an exchange of family gifts and instead pledge their allotted holiday money to famine relief efforts.

Our Government has also generously responded by providing more than \$366 million since October 1 to the nations of Africa for famine relief, with \$150 million alone provided to Ethiopia. We can be justifiably proud of our response to the humanitarian needs on the African Continent. However, the situation there is still critical. We cannot afford the luxury of sitting back to admire what we have accomplished. There is much more to be done.

Nearly 200 people die each day in Ethiopian feeding camps, while millions of others throughout the continent are confronted by the real possibility of death by starvation. We must develop new ways to meet the life-threatening prospects of drought victims. One of the greatest needs is to find easily digestible nourishment. Often the emergency food provided to those whose bodies have been ravaged by starvation is rejected because it requires breakdown by the digestive system that the body is unable to perform.

If another drought disaster of this scope is to be avoided, the provision of farming technology is imperative. Within the constraints of our laws toward the affected nations we must provide for the teaching of skills which will yield enough food for the African population.

I commend my colleagues Mr. CONTE and Mrs. ROUKEMA for reserving time for this special order to focus on the

future needs of those whose lives have been imperiled by the drought. I urge my colleagues to support ongoing relief efforts when this body addresses the relevant legislation.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud the efforts of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who have joined together to fashion H.R. 1096, a bill which will provide famine relief for the millions starving in Africa. As a cosponsor of H.R. 100, I am pleased to also identify my name with H.R. 1096.

This bipartisan effort is eloquent testimony to the spirit of sharing and giving that is the hallmark of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to join with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and with the American people, who have opened their hearts and generously responded to the cry for help from Africa.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is time to fully mobilize the resources of this great Nation to meet the challenge of the current famine in sub-Saharan Africa. Over 150 million people in 24 countries are in some way affected by the worst drought in recent history. Every moment we delay leads to a further loss of life. Those who survive may be developmentally impaired for the rest of their lives.

In Ethiopia, 300,000 people have died; 2½ million people in that country are reported to be in immediate life-threatening jeopardy. Almost 8 million people are affected by the famine.

In Mozambique, the Government has a minimal stock of 1,300 tons of grain when the need is estimated at 3,450. Estimates are that 100,000 people in that country died in 1983.

In Burkina Faso, which has the highest reported infant mortality rate in the world, crop losses are severe. One northern province of that nation has reported a 95-percent crop loss for the second consecutive year.

In Cameroon, severe water shortages are plaguing both human beings and livestock. Refugees from Chad, pouring over their border in search of food, are further stretching scarce resources.

In Somalia, a country of only 4 million people, three-quarters of a million refugees are totally dependent on assistance for all basic needs. They continue to cross the Ethiopian border attempting to escape the desperate conditions of their country.

We also know of the plight of people in Mauritania, Niger, Kenya, Sudan, Senegal, Burundi, Ruanda, Tanzania, Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

Despite these facts, the administration has cut its food aid request for 1986, citing as the reason its uncer-

tainty about the continuation of the drought. They request an appropriation which would provide 395,000 metric tons of food. Clearly, they are underestimating the current need for food aid, just as they have done for the past 2 years.

Fortunately, Members of the House of Representatives are more realistic in their request. H.R. 100, a bill co-sponsored by over 90 Members of the House, provides funds for 1.7 million metric tons of food. H.R. 606 would include an appropriation for 1.2 million metric tons of food.

But immediate food aid, as important as it is, is not enough. Money is needed for medical care, clothing, blankets, and other emergency aid for those suffering from the famine. So, also, is money for long-term development programs, refugee aid, food transportation, and food storage. In each of these areas, my colleagues in the House have seen fit to be more generous than the President would have us be.

And, given the political situation in a number of African countries, we must do all that we can to ensure that food provided is received by all those in need, not just those who subscribe to the political ideology of the ruling leaders. The voluntary agencies working in Africa are devising creative plans to ensure that this occurs. Their efforts in this area, as well as in the entire distribution operation, must be applauded. But more is needed, and only the Government can provide the funds to ensure that all of those suffering receive the help they so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Burek of the British Broadcasting Co. has brought the human tragedy of hunger and starvation in Africa into the consciousness of the world. We are all aware of the problems. It is time to move from awareness to action, from study to implementation, from compassion to responsibility.●

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the efforts of a small group of seventh graders in my district who worked to alleviate some of the pain and suffering of their fellow human beings.

The seventh grade of Regional School District No. 7, under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Bruce Miller, raised \$1,800 to aid the people of Ethiopia. They donated the money to Africa to purchase agricultural tools and seeds to aid the Ethiopian people. The money was raised through a dinner they organized from start to finish.

Their actions reflect a variety of lessons that go beyond any one subject. Geography, agriculture, international trade, and Third World economics are all valuable academic lessons. But these remarkable young people are learning compassion for others, and an understanding of the complex yet

fragile web of interdependence of one person upon another, regardless of age, color, or nationality.

With the rapid advances in technology, our world is only growing more complex with each passing day, not less. The opportunities to reach out across the boundaries of both space and experience to relate to others on an individual level are what provides us with an understanding of the scope of these complex problems as well as alternative solutions.

I commend Mr. Miller, and the entire seventh grade at R.S. No. 7 in Winsted, CT, for their innovative and heartfelt response to the plight of the starving Ethiopian people.●

● Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, we have all noted here the extraordinary aid given by individual Americans to the famine-stricken peoples of Africa. By the end of January, the American Council for Voluntary International Action, known as Interaction, reported to us that they had received hundreds of thousands of dollars in private donations and \$60 million in total aid for Ethiopian relief activities. It is gratifying, in fact overwhelming, to witness such an outpouring of concern.

The American people, by their generosity, have sent a clear signal to the Congress that we should set aside political concerns and address the problem of famine with great urgency. We have responded by assembling several commendable legislative packages in order to continue our massive relief programs for the remainder of fiscal year 1985. The House and the Senate committees responsible for these bills have placed them at the forefront of their agendas and have already begun hearings and markups.

Yet despite this expeditious approach, we are already beginning to see bottlenecks emerge, bottlenecks on both sides of the Atlantic which threaten to choke off the short-term and long-term aid that are essential parts of any strategy for Africa's revival. The most serious obstacle we face in getting food aid to starving people is political strife. In Ethiopia, in Mozambique, in Chad, and in the Sudan, governments beleaguered by armed insurgencies withhold food shipments from famished people in areas controlled by insurgents.

But while we cannot deny the strength of these armed movements, we also cannot deny the right of all people to food. In short, Mr. Speaker, access to food should not hinge on political alliance. The Congress must be adamant that the tremendous food aid which the American people have so generously donated is received by those people who truly need it. We must warn the Government of Ethiopia that we will not tolerate the confiscation of food shipment destined for the northern regions of Ethiopia, where starvation has become the

norm. We cannot condone that government's use of vital food aid as a carrot with which to lure starving people from their ancestral homelands in the north to uncertain futures in southern Ethiopia. The guerillas operating in Tigray and Eritrea have agreed to the "safe passage" of aid-carrying vehicles operated by internationally recognized relief organizations, but the government refuses to guarantee such passage.

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, America and her allies, in concert with the International Red Cross, the U.N. High Commission on Refugees and a number of private voluntary organizations, began massive food shipments to Cambodia, which was also facing famine conditions. The Government of Cambodia was given the type of logistical assistance necessary to better distribute the food aid. But instead, government officials kept most of the aid within city limits and away from the rural areas where people suffered from starvation and malnourishment. At the same time, bags of grain and other staples were diverted to swelling black markets, where government officials and others reaped huge profits.

The same phenomena are occurring in Ethiopia and some other African countries receiving food aid. Let us avoid our past mistakes, and unambiguously inform African governments that we will not permit the obstruction and diversion of food aid intended for starving people.

Let us also begin to focus on how we can assist these countries in the future. While we have responded to the current crisis with speed and vigor, we bear partial responsibility for the state that Africa finds itself in. Over the past few years, American development assistance has steadily eroded, a trend that is highlighted this year in the administration's foreign aid budget request. Now more than ever, that request is tilted toward military assistance at the expense of long-term agricultural and economic development aid. In fact, the aid proposal, by increasing military assistance by 15 percent, directs over two-thirds of foreign aid to developing countries for security purposes. Meanwhile, under the proposed fiscal year 1986 budget, total development assistance levels will decline by nearly \$500 million, and will affect efforts in health care, family planning, and agriculture programs.

Although it may be beyond our control to break the bottleneck impeding the flow of food aid to African famine victims, it is certainly within our power to open the bottleneck that appears to be closing in on long-term development assistance. We must reverse the decline in America's share of long-term aid and follow on the heels of our relief effort with a carefully planned and well-funded agricultural

and economic aid program that will help Africans chart a course of self-sufficiency in food.

I am encouraged by the legislative approach taken by both H.R. 100, the Weiss-Wolpe-Leland bill and H.R. 606, the Conte-Roukema bill. Each seeks supplemental appropriations not only for food aid, but also for long-term development assistance. Although they differ over the totals to be spent, they share the common objective of beginning the eradication of hunger in Africa. I have joined as a cosponsor of H.R. 100 and urge my colleagues to seriously evaluate these two legislative proposals and support them as a means of loosening one of the major bottlenecks we confront. And as we continue to send aid to Africa, let us also continue to pressure recalcitrant African governments into fairly distributing the food aid so generously donated by people around the world. By opening these two bottlenecks and keeping them open, we can attain the goal of ensuring that the people of Africa have sufficient food supplies, now and in the future. ●

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in Ethiopia, a drought-stricken country, the enormity of the hunger problem baffles the mind. As I visited the feeding centers where gentle humans are restoring life to some of the starving, I was bewildered as to how to solve this crisis.

The problem of famine in Africa is real. Twenty nations have been affected. Seven are critical. Just in Ethiopia alone, over 7 million people are threatened by starvation.

A severe drought is a major cause. The rains either did not come or were less than is required to germinate the seeds in the fertile soil.

Agriculture techniques are backward. There are few drilled wells, little irrigation, almost no fertilizer used and severe topsoil erosion. If there is to be problem solving, it will be long term and it will be painful. Attitudes will have to be changed to use modern agricultural methods. And in Marxist countries, the collective farm reduces the farmer's incentive to produce for himself and only aggravates the sparse production.

There have been four major droughts in Ethiopia in the last 35 years. People have died of starvation. But this is the worst drought and death is apparent throughout the land.

My visit to Alamata and Korem, two feeding centers 250 miles north of Addis Ababa, was shocking. The emaciated bodies of young and old were overwhelming. One's emotions cannot be controlled as you see the helpless trying to survive. The huge numbers dulled my sense of hope.

Thousands have died and thousands more died in remote villages which statistics will not record. But there is

hope—because humankind is responding—and responding well.

The free world is responding swiftly by sharing its abundance of food, medicine, and blankets. Help from Western nations, from the private sector and from government, is pouring in. People are acting out of their best humanitarian instincts.

The United States is leading the pack. There are not many "ugly Americans" in Africa today. We are responding from our generosity. And America is responding mightily.

Americans are responding as a government. President Reagan has announced his intention to provide one-half of the food assistance needed in Africa this year—a \$500 million U.S. contribution. For Ethiopia, a Marxist state, with whom we have strained relations, \$130 million in food is already planned. This Government-supplied grain is distributed by many private volunteer agencies, such as Catholic Relief and World Vision, and soon some will be given directly to the Ethiopian Government relief agency. The sacks bear the words: "Donated by the People of the United States of America."

The private sector is also responding. For 1985, food assistance to Ethiopia through private organizations is estimated to be \$125 million, with another \$22 million spent on Ethiopian refugees elsewhere.

The private sector from Florida responded magnificently. A flight of mercy was organized, funded, loaded, and flown to Addis Ababa, which bespeaks the generosity of Floridians.

The mission was conceived by my wife, Grace Nelson, as a needed response to the problems she had seen in Africa last summer. In Mali, she held a starving child in her arms. She has not been able to forget it. After organizing some fundraising activities, the thought of a flight of mercy came from a discussion with the editor of the Florida Times Union. He suggested that although people wanted to help, they needed a concrete mission to respond to and one which could be tracked to a successful conclusion.

This story is an American success story. A DC-8 was chartered and loaded with 40 tons of food, medicine and blankets, in the midst of ongoing fund drives. WCPX-TV in Orlando collected over \$80,000 and two truckloads of blankets. World Vision, a Christian humanitarian organization, provided the mechanism for obtaining the 2 tons of medicine and 38 tons of fortified food, 11 tons of which were donated by a former Ethiopian official in Indiana. This special mixture of oats, powdered milk, and honey, known as ATMIT, is indigenous to Ethiopia. Another \$120,000 was raised before the flight departed Chicago on January 12.

The plane was so long you could hardly see from one end of the cargo bay to the other. During the 24-hour journey, our group of "food shepherds" slept on top of the pallets of fortified food using some of the donated blankets for warmth. It was a good feeling to know that our mission was one of trying to help the starving by actually taking food to them.

Our landing was the first of a stretch DC-8 on the Addis Ababa runway. TransAmerican Airlines and World Vision soon had the cargo unloaded.

Success does not come easily and indeed we soon had our problems. Food was being delayed to the feeding centers because rebel activity in the region interrupted transportation of supplies. When we finally were cleared for an old DC-3 to fly us to the camps, we found they were running dangerously low on food. But our supplies arrived just in time.

I shall never forget the children, also starved for affection, clinging to my hands and arms smiling in spite of their physical deprivation. They were proof that the World Vision feeding center was successful because only a few weeks before they had been lifeless and lethargic. Others were in intensive care, often with their mothers, as nutritional supplements were administered—sometimes through a tube because they were too weak to eat.

The staff was loving and kind, it showed. The nuns at the Missionaries of Charity compound ministered to the dying. These sisters are sponsored by Mother Teresa of Calcutta, who had just paid a visit, greeting and blessing each person in the camp—9,000 of them. What a lesson in love.

There are those who say, "let them die." Their theories of overpopulation and survival of the fittest are practical, they say. Besides "why should we care about a foreign, strange land?" Fortunately, most of America does not think that way. The good will, hopes and prayers of Floridians were obvious in our specific flight of mercy. Many have responded before, others are following.

This mission was successful because of the spirit and character of our people. Perhaps it is best summed up in Matthew chapter 25. "When you did it for the least of these, you were doing it for me." ●

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the occasion of this special order in reference to the ongoing tragic situation in Africa.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their statesmanship and compassion in considering aid for the several hundreds of thousands in danger of starvation in Africa. I strongly support increasing aid to these unfortunate victims.

However, during the consideration of relief legislation, there has been little or no mention of Ethiopia's failure to effectively anticipate and ameliorate famine conditions in its own countryside. To this end, I recently introduced House Concurrent Resolution 43, a measure that criticizes the Ethiopian Government for its failure and for its hindrance of relief efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the efforts of this committee to help the suffering going on in Africa, but the United States cannot solve the problem alone. The Soviet Union, although in a firm alliance with Ethiopia, has responded to aid needs with little more than symbolic gestures, sending last year approximately 10,000 metric tons of rice and several tons of salt, even though Ethiopia is an exporter of salt.

The Ethiopian central government (Dergue) has done little on its own to help the suffering of its people. In fact, instead of diverting resources toward irrigating agrarian lands, it has chosen to equip its 500,000-person military organization. Moreover, the Dergue has proven reluctant to assist in the food distribution efforts in Eritrea and Tigre, areas of civil strife. For example, aid ships full of supplies have been delayed at unloading docks in favor of Soviet cargo ships laden with military goods. Supply trucks have also been delayed or actually destroyed to areas with reported rebel activity, with devastating effects for innocent civilians.

Mr. Chairman, a clear message must be transmitted to the Government of Ethiopia that the relief system is not available for its individual and political disposal, that those who seek to assist famine victims will no longer abide by further restrictions or hindrances. Whether as language in a supplemental measure or in resolution form, I hope my colleagues here and in the full House will join in a bipartisan effort to demonstrate to the Dergue and Colonel Mengistu the imperative need for direct reform and responsibility in this grave matter. ●

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, there are few problems confronting the world today that are more pressing than world hunger, and more specifically, the famine that is plaguing millions of Africans.

Yesterday, in his testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary of State Shultz spoke about the food crisis in Africa saying that, "If they—millions of African people—are to survive, they need urgent assistance in terms of food, medical care, and shelter." The Secretary was right; we must continue to aid the African people.

We can no longer put the plight of these suffering people on the back pages of our consciousness. We can no longer relegate Africa to the status of

puppet in the drama of East-West confrontation. The African people need our help. We are responding, but we must make sure that we continue to do so for as long and as much as it is necessary.

Ethiopia is not the only nation crippled by this tragedy—Niger, the Sudan, Kenya, and Mozambique—to name a few are all suffering. This is not a political question. It is a question of survival; it is a question of heeding the call of poor, starving people who have nowhere else to turn.

The U.S. Government, as I said, has responded to this call, but I believe that we can do more. I believe we have to do more in order to truly confront the epic misery and privation confronting these people. This means not only food aid but long-term development assistance. As the Bible says, it is time to turn our swords into plowshares so that our brothers and sisters in Africa may live; so that they may have the promise of a future. ●

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, we are starting a new Congress which must rapidly deal with an old problem: the African famine. This is an enormous task, one which requires both immediate attention and long-term focus; it is a task which demands our continuing attention.

This famine is the result of a drought which is now over 3 years old in many regions. We were warned 3 years ago that this famine was on the horizon. Yet, we waited until the death toll had reached tragic proportions before we began to seriously address the problem.

Last fall, media reports began flooding our lives with reports of starving children in Ethiopia. These reports prompted an overwhelming and generous response by Americans and people around the world. Relief agencies working on the African Continent were inundated with calls. This winter, the Peace Corps sent out a request for volunteers with farming backgrounds and received thousands of applications within weeks. The United States has already committed twice as much aid this fiscal year as we sent last year. I am proud to be a citizen of a country which expresses such compassion for peoples halfway around the world.

Still, Africa is not out of danger. In fact, its situation worsens daily. We must not allow our past deeds of good will to lull us into a false sense of complacency about the African situation. It will be a long time before Africa can stand on her own again.

Currently, 21 countries in Africa face food shortages. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] recently estimated that the combined food needs in Africa will come to 6.6 million tons of food this year, twice the amount needed last year. Our past aid has saved tens of

thousands of lives, but there are millions in danger.

This December, several relief sites in Ethiopia, Sudan, Mali, Mozambique, and elsewhere ran precariously low on food, because of inconsistencies and delays in food shipments. While the food pipeline was filled at our end, the lag between the time food left the United States and the time it actually reached the hungry was too long. Mr. Speaker, this situation did not happen overnight; we were warned this fall that this type of catastrophe would occur if food shipments were broken. We cannot allow a break in food shipments again or we will face the same severe and unnecessary loss of lives later on this spring.

In January, President Reagan announced an increased assistance program for Africa, a move which I applaud. Yet, Peter McPhearson, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, stated that unless supplemental appropriations are passed by Congress by March 1, U.S. shipments of food will again be interrupted.

Mr. Speaker, it is already February 20. We must all work to get additional funds passed by the end of this month. Early this winter, Congressman Weiss introduced H.R. 100, which I cosponsored, to appropriate over a billion in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1985. The United States traditionally supplies half of international emergency assistance for disasters, and these funds, in addition to the amount already committed, would bring U.S. assistance up to half of the total projected need for 1985. Representatives ROUKEMA and CONTE introduced H.R. 606 which would provide a smaller, but still substantial amount of assistance. A compromise bill, H.R. 1097 has been introduced which would provide \$526.5 million for additional food assistance and \$137.5 million for disaster assistance. We must pass these supplemental provisions before further delay results in the needless loss of lives.

But we also face another challenge. In the coming months, in addition to appropriating vital emergency aid, we must also work to improve our assistance programs and consider ways to help Africa in the long run. This must include increasing our research and development efforts of applicable agriculture; increasing technology transfer to Africa; and encouraging more educational programs both in the United States for Africans and in Africa for her people.

We have faced this challenge before. Fifteen years ago, southern Asia was on the verge of famine, while Africa was a net food exporter. Today, Asia is largely food self-sufficient, while Africa, where food production per capita has declined steadily each year,

is in the midst of the worst famine in this century. Political turmoil and drought contributed to this famine, but much of the starvation could have been prevented had we heeded advance warnings and initiated a proper agricultural development program. Asia's agricultural success took several years and is due mainly to the research and extension work done under the "Green Revolution." Unfortunately, most of the technologies which aided Asia are not transferable to Africa, due to different soil and climate conditions, as well as a poorly developed research and extension system in Africa.

The drought has caused tremendous damage in Africa. Farmers have left their land, seed stocks have been eaten, and soil erosion has increased the desert's spread. Because of this damage, Africa will need enormous help not just in emergency food assistance, but in longer-term assistance as well. I feel strongly that the United States should contribute to this revival.

This is an enormous task. But we cannot allow ourselves to be satisfied with anything less. It has been estimated that food shortages will occur in Africa for years to come. Africans will continue to starve until Africa can once again support her own.

I would like to call to my colleagues' attention to an article which appeared in the February 11, 1985 Christian Science Monitor.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 11, 1985]

FOOD AID TO AFRICA SLACKENS BUT NEED EXPECTED TO DOUBLE NEXT YEAR
(By David K. Willis)

The world aid effort to feed the hungry in Africa is caught in a crunch.

Aid from private, individual pockets and purses is slowing down. Efforts by the United Nations, private agencies, and governments are beset by politics in Ethiopia and are not well coordinated overall, diplomats and private analysts agree.

Yet famine in Africa is worsening. The UN estimates that the 21 worst-hit countries will need twice as much food aid this year as they needed last year.

A complex picture of the situation emerges from Monitor telephone interviews with public, private, and government sources in London, Rome, New York, and Washington.

On the one hand:

The massive response from individuals in the West to pleas for food donations to Africa—a response that has seen about \$60 million donated in the US and as much as \$112 million in Europe since October—is beginning to slacken.

The fear is that the graphic television pictures of African famine victims aired last autumn might only have created a donor cycle in the West—a cycle, as one analysis has it, of "shock, pity, giving, feeling better, and forgetting."

The slowdown is reported by private agencies here such as Oxfam International and Save the Children, and also by a private campaign that raised \$1.12 million in Brit-

ain to send wheat to Ethiopia between June and December last year.

Overall coordination of the global aid flow remains a problem. While the US and some other governments continue to pour food and other supplies into Africa (the US effort alone may reach \$1 billion in the fiscal year ending Sept. 30), private aid agencies and the UN may not be coordinated enough to respond well to the current situation.

Some private agencies are unhappy with new coordination machinery set up by the UN. "The UN is so compartmentalized," says Hugh Mackay, director of overseas operations for Save the Children (UK). "It lacks the sense of urgency that is so needed."

At the same time, some private donors think the private agencies themselves need to show more efficiency to match their generous motives. "Well meaning, but too often disorganized," is how one donor characterizes the agencies.

Meanwhile, the situation in Africa is worsening:

Famine in the Horn of Africa, westward in the Sahel, and south in Mozambique is growing so much worse that the 21 most needy countries will need 6.6 million tons of food aid this year, according to the latest famine report by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Rome. The countries needed half that amount—3.3 million tons—last year.

Pledges from donors have reached 4.4 million tons, but the FAO reports that "less than half of the known pledges have yet to be delivered." There are fears of an aid "gap" after April, though the UN World Food Program says pledges are in sight after April.

Growing alarm is heard here about the Sudan, which so far has lacked the kind of dramatic television coverage that roused public concern for Ethiopia.

So many refugees are pouring into Sudan from other countries—including as many as 250,000 from Uganda and 100,000 from Chad—that the total number is now put at 1 million. They exacerbate drought conditions in Dafur and Kardofan to the west, and in the Red Sea hills among the Beja nomads. Large crowds are camping at Omdurman, on the bank of the Nile opposite Khartoum.

The population of a former watering hole called Wad Kowli, also just across the Ethiopian border, has jumped from a handful of people last December to some 85,000 today as refugees from the province of Tigre drag themselves across into Sudan. Conditions are so desperate that the private agency in charge, Save the Children (UK), reports that the camp will need to be moved in 20 days because it has almost run out of water.

In Ethiopia, the FAO now estimates that 7.7 million people face food shortages or starvation. This is more than 1 million higher than estimates made last autumn.

In northern Ethiopia, in the Tigre and Eritrea provinces that are waging civil war against the Marxist government in Addis Ababa, so many areas are now uninhabitable that refugees are fleeing across the border into Sudan at a rate that may be as high as 2,000 people a day.

"You also have politics," says one international aid official. "The port of Massawa, to the north, isn't being used because it is the port for areas held by rebels in the civil war." So, he notes, "You still have Ethiopia, a country of 40 million people, depending on a single small U-shaped port—Assab on the Red Sea—with only five berths."●

● Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today's special order on Africa recognizes the immediacy of the crisis throughout that troubled continent.

This Congress, my home district in Michigan, and concerned Americans across this country have become increasingly alarmed at the urgent plight of those in dire need in Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, the Sudan, and elsewhere. Ten million lives are at risk. It is literally vital that we in Congress act as quickly as possible.

Last night, the House Foreign Affairs Committee agreed on a compromise proposal providing emergency supplemental appropriations for African aid in the amount of \$701.5 million. The legislation is presently before the Appropriations Committee, which I hope will move it swiftly to the floor.

Seldom does our legislative agenda provide us with more tangible evidence of the challenge confronting us. What is needed is clear and very real: Wheat, corn, sorghum, and chick peas; blankets and tents, transportation to take these materials to the people who need them and personnel to distribute them, and medicine for the sick.

The list is short—the task is enormous. By the time we see the faces of the starving children on the evening news, many of them have already died. Many more will die before \$705.1 million will meet even the most immediate needs. Let us demonstrate that we have the resolve to rise to this challenge.●

● Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, last Christmas eve a cargo plane flew from Portland, OR, to Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on a mission of mercy. Oregonians watched its progress on television while they celebrated the holidays; the flight represented their gift of life to those dying of disease and starvation.

A month previous the U.S. National Bank of Oregon had initiated a drive, Oregonians Helping Ethiopians, for relief funds by opening the doors of the bank's 186 branch offices to donors with a promise to match the first \$50,000 collected. Evergreen International Airlines of McMinnville, OR, had already offered to donate all costs of a flight to Ethiopia.

Within 2 weeks an extraordinary outpouring from 10,000 people of all ages and incomes raised \$580,000. Many businesses, too many to recount here, gave food, medical supplies, and storage space. With labor donated by the bank and other volunteers, a pleneload of supplies was purchased and readied within days. Once in Ethiopia, the goods were immediately distributed by World Vision.

With remaining funds, a ship was outfitted and sailed from Portland last Saturday, with a much greater store of food and medical supplies. Northwest

medical teams has just sent a corps of 15 volunteer doctors and nurses to Ethiopia to serve the emergency health needs of refugees there. Another group is preparing to leave in March.

To my knowledge Oregon's was the first statewide private effort for African famine relief. The Oregon project has inspired others throughout the country and has demonstrated, once again, that the human community does not end at arbitrary State or national borders, but extends as far as awareness of human suffering can take it.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts and concerns of Oregonians have been repeated nationwide. In 1985, Americans donated nearly \$60 million to provide for the needs of the hungry and homeless in Africa. But even this great outpouring cannot begin to address the need.

Conditions in the Horn of Africa, the Sahel and Mozambique are desperate. Nearly 21 African nations will need 6.6 million tons of food aid this year—double the need level of last year. In Ethiopia alone nearly 8 million people face food shortages or starvation.

To meet the increasing demand, the United States doubled its contribution to African relief efforts for fiscal year 1985. However, our emergency feeding programs have been all but depleted after only 3 months. The U.S. Agency for International Development estimates that U.S. feeding programs will be crippled if additional funds are not approved by Congress by the end of this month.

It is absolutely imperative that Congress approve additional money as soon as possible. For that reason, I fully support the proposals to provide an additional \$701.5 million for emergency famine relief. Of this total, \$526.5 million is earmarked for food aid and transportation costs. An additional \$137.5 million is earmarked for emergency shelter, land rehabilitation, and refugee assistance programs, marking the beginning of U.S. efforts to prevent similar disasters in years to come.

Aside from emergency relief efforts, the United States must provide the wherewithal for the proud people of Africa—seeds, tools, and technical help—for them to grow their own food and become self-sufficient as they have been for centuries. I pledge my efforts to working for legislation that will meet the long-term development needs of Africa.●

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern over the suffering of the thousands of people starving in Ethiopia. Like my colleagues, I have been horrified by the reports that over 300,000 people perished from starvation in 1984. The effects of the current drought plaguing the country could be even more

devastating. Following 3 successive years of exceptionally low rainfall, the 1984 crop harvest is significantly smaller than any harvest in the last 3 years, and it is estimated that this meager harvest will be consumed by the end of February. In fact, the total food aid requirement for Ethiopia and its refugees in 1985 will be 1.5 million metric tons of grain. If the food aid requirement is not met, the number of people who die every day in Ethiopia's feeding camps could climb well beyond the current figure of 200.

No group has endured greater hardship in Ethiopia than the Falashas. At least 2,000 Ethiopian Jews have died in refugee camps in Sudan since last spring and still 3,000 are believed to be in Sudanese refugee camps. While as many as 15,000 Ethiopian Jews have managed to emigrate to Israel, an estimated 7,000 still remain in Ethiopia. Those Jews remaining in Ethiopia suffer more than the horrors of the famine. They are caught in the crossfire between the government and rebel armies. Moreover, Ethiopian Jews have been subjected to religious repression by a government that has supported the burning of Hebrew books, the incarceration of teachers, and the closing of schools where Hebrew is taught. Recently, two Ethiopians who had escorted three of our colleagues—Senators TRIBLE and DeCONCINI and Representative ACKERMAN—to Falasha camps were attacked and beaten by men identified as government authorities. It is imperative that we not sit idly by and allow this repression to continue.

We cannot cease our efforts until every Ethiopian Jew is allowed to emigrate to Israel. I pledge my continued support for efforts to provide assistance to combat the drought, such as H.R. 100, which would provide over 700 million in supplemental assistance to drought-stricken Africa, and I urge our Government and all other governments, to do all that they can to see that the Ethiopian Jews are allowed to emigrate.●

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, Americans have witnessed with horror the drought and famine which has struck Africa in recent months. In all, 150 million people in 27 countries are affected by this disaster. Our Nation has reacted generously to this tragedy as individuals and groups from all walks of life and backgrounds have donated vast amounts of relief money.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 100, a supplemental appropriation bill which will provide major increases in famine relief and recovery assistance for fiscal years 1985 and 1986.

Specifically, the bill increases funds for the Food for Peace title II program by \$787 million. This will provide money to purchase and ship 1.7 million metric tons of food, an estimated

half of Africa's emergency food needs. As the world's largest food producer, the United States has traditionally provided at least half of international food assistance in emergencies.

The supplemental bill also contains an additional \$225 million in nonfood aid, mainly for projects to promote long-term recovery. It is vital that we link emergency aid to projects that promote a return to normal farm production.

This recovery aid has four main components. First, \$80 million for rehabilitation programs involving the health, water, and agricultural development needs of the poor. Second, \$70 million for foreign disaster aid, such as shelter, blankets, and fertilizer. Third, \$50 million for assisting refugees and displaced persons. Fourth, \$25 million for overcoming the transportation and storage problems of regular food aid programs of the poorest Africans.

Mr. Speaker, the World Food Council at its 10th anniversary session last June stated that hunger today is largely created by human error or neglect. Human indifference perpetuates it and human resolve can eradicate it. I firmly agree with this assessment and have seen for myself how American aid has saved lives throughout Africa and the world. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 100 and other legislation which promotes relief for this horrible tragedy in Africa.●

STATEMENT ON THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1986 REAGAN BUDGET ON THE 21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1985 President Reagan submitted his fiscal year 1986 budget to the Congress and the American people. The President's fiscal year 1986 \$973.75 billion budget plan would finance a massive \$30 billion increase in defense spending with severe cutbacks in domestic programs, totaling nearly \$40 billion. I oppose this unfair, irrational, and irresponsible transfer of funding from programs for the people to programs for war. Once again, it appears that this budget is being balanced on the backs of the poor and the disadvantaged. Already, the American people have begun to understand the truly negative impact of this budget, and have begun to speak out in opposition to it.

In my own congressional district—the 21st District of Ohio—it is patently clear that the passage of the President's budget will hurt the quality of life for many needy and disadvantaged people. The fiscal year 1986 budget

will produce another victim—the middle class.

Further, not only does this budget hurt people, but also it will stunt ongoing community revitalization efforts. Major metropolitan centers, such as the Cleveland area, are just beginning to progress after years of decay and the devastating impact of the Reagan recession. This budget, if passed, will set the clock back on the revitalization of these great urban centers.

I have consulted with numerous program experts in my district with respect to the impact of the Federal budget proposals in the areas of employment, education, health, housing and transportation, et cetera. That impact, not only in my district, but also in districts across America, must be our primary focus as we begin deliberations on the President's budget request. For those reasons, I would like to share with my colleagues my analysis of how the 21st Congressional District of Ohio will fare under the administration's budget plan.

STATEMENT ON THE IMPACT OF THE FISCAL
YEAR 1986 REAGAN BUDGET ON THE 21ST
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO
EMPLOYMENT

Despite continuing high levels of unemployment in Cleveland, Ohio and in other parts of the country the federal government will play a diminishing role in supporting local employment and training programs. Federal support for employment and training activities has been drastically cut since 1980, when \$8.1 billion was available under the Comprehensive Training and Employment Act. Job training appropriations have now dwindled under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to \$3.5 billion in FY 1985 and will further decrease to \$2.8 billion in FY 1986, under the President's budget plan. Fiscal year 1986 funding for the largest component of JTPA—the Employment and Training Block Grant—would be frozen at \$1.886 billion. The second largest JTPA component—the Summer Youth Employment Program, now funded at \$825 million, would lose \$100 million in FY 1985 and another \$60 million in FY 1986. With Summer Youth jobs funding reduced to a total program level of \$664 million, summer jobs for 67,000 teenagers across the country would be eliminated. A third JTPA component—the Dislocated Workers Program, now funded at \$223 million, would be cut by \$120 million in FY 1985 and by another \$3 million in FY 1986. Finally, the \$617 million Job Corps Program, a fourth JTPA component—would be terminated altogether.

In summary, the President's budget proposals for employment and training assistance represent bad news for the unemployed residents and the youth of the 21st District and the Cleveland area. More than 61,000 people are unemployed in Cuyahoga County. Of these individuals, more than half live in the City of Cleveland, which had an unemployment rate of 13.2 percent in December 1984, the most recent month available. This high level of unemployment reflects the large proportion of low income and minority Cleveland families who need job training and large number of middle income persons who need retraining because

of plant closings and fewer job opportunities in the auto and steel industries.

No additional help will be coming to Cleveland from Washington, D.C., however. The tremendous need for job training assistance for Cleveland residents is currently addressed by Cleveland's share of about \$20.0 million in funds from JTPA. For FY 1986, the City of Cleveland can expect to receive at most about \$13 million in JTPA funds—a loss of about \$7 million under the President's proposed budget. Most of the loss would be realized by the closing of the Cleveland Job Corps Center, which currently receives in excess of \$5.0 million from the U.S. Department of Labor. If President Reagan is successful in terminating the successful Job Corps Program, 530 disadvantaged Cleveland youth each year would lose valuable skills training in allied health occupations, clerical and data entry positions. Cleveland would also lose the resources for the Summer Youth Employment program in the amount of about \$500 thousand. As a result, more than 625 much needed summer jobs for teenagers would be lost. It is doubtful that these young people could be accommodated in the City of Cleveland's other job training programs.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

President Reagan's FY 1986 budget fails to give education the high priority called for by the President's National Commission on Excellence in Education by freezing at about FY 1985 levels the three largest federal elementary and secondary education programs for compensatory, handicapped and vocational education. These programs would be funded at \$3.647 billion, \$1.306 billion and \$738 billion, respectively, in the FY 1986 budget. Several other but smaller education programs, however, would receive deep budget cuts, including Impact Aid (22 percent), bilingual education (17 percent) and Special Programs under the Chapter 2 Block Grant (69 percent). Additionally, the budget calls for a rescission of the \$75 million in FY 1985 funding appropriated for the new Magnet Schools Grants for school districts undergoing desegregation. Overall, the President's budget request for elementary and secondary education programs totals \$7.481 billion, a decrease of \$271 million below the FY 1985 appropriated level.

The Cleveland Public Schools and other urban school districts will have difficulty maintaining quality programs for the disadvantaged, handicapped and language minority children under the Administration's virtual freeze on federal support for elementary and secondary education. In FY 1985, the Cleveland Public Schools can expect to receive about \$18-19 million in elementary and secondary education aid, including \$13.5 million in aid from the Chapter 1 Compensatory Education program. About the same amount of funding would be available for Cleveland's school children in FY 1986, under the President's budget plan.

Of major consequence to the 21st District is the President's decision to cancel \$75 million in FY 1985 funding for a new program financing the development of magnet schools in desegregating school districts.

The Cleveland Public Schools received \$7 million in FY 1980 and \$4 million in FY 1981 to finance the implementation of desegregation activities, primarily the establishment of magnet schools. These dollars are no longer available due to the enactment of the Chapter 2 Block Grant in FY 1982. If Congress concurs in the termination of the new Magnet Schools program, Cleveland will lose a valuable and much needed

infusion of new resources to strengthen and further develop the City's magnet schools.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Under President Reagan's FY 1986 budget proposals, the dream to pursue a higher education at the college of one's choice would no longer become a reality for many students in the 21st Congressional District and throughout the nation. A reduction of 25 percent in federal support for student financial aid is included in the FY 1986 budget, with total funding for student grants, loans and work opportunities dropping from \$8.3 billion in FY 1985 to \$6.3 billion in FY 1986. The President's budget also proposes a major restructuring of federal student aid programs which would place a heavy burden on parents and students to finance a larger share of college expenses. Most notably, eligibility for Pell Grants, National Direct Student Loans and College Work Study would be restricted to students from families with adjusted gross annual incomes of \$25,000 or less. A similar income cap of \$32,500 for eligibility for Guaranteed Student Loans (GSLs) would be established. Additionally, no student would be able to receive more than \$4,000 annually in aid from the Department of Education and each student would be required to contribute \$800 to his or her college expenses before receiving any federal assistance. These proposals would have the greatest impact on students from middle income families.

Assistance for higher education is a high priority for many families in the 21st Congressional District. Yet, under President Reagan's proposals, students from one-third of all families in the district would be ineligible for federal Pell Grants, National Direct Student Loans or College Work Study. About 15 percent of 21st District families would be ineligible for Guaranteed Student Loans, which carry a lower interest rate than commercial loans.

Needless to say, under President Reagan's proposals, many bright and talented 21st District students would be unable to attend the college of their choice because of financial need. A cap of \$4,000 on the total amount of assistance that each student may receive would permit many students to attend only lower cost two and four year colleges.

More than 40 percent of the 65,000 students currently enrolled in the 13 higher education institutions in Cuyahoga County receive one or more types of aid from the Department of Education. Students most affected by the \$4,000 mega-cap on federal student aid would be graduate and professional students and students attending more expensive institutions, such as Case Western Reserve University (CWRU). For example, one-third of the undergraduate enrollment, or about 940 students, at CWRU would lose about \$1 million in federal aid under the \$4,000 mega-cap proposal. The 2,700 graduate and professional students at CWRU who now receive GSLs would also lose more than \$1 million in assistance under the mega-cap.

However, at the other end of the spectrum, even lower cost institutions such as Cuyahoga Community College and Cleveland State University may find the very neediest students being squeezed by the \$4,000 mega-cap.

The proposed income caps on Pell Grants, Guaranteed Student Loans and other aid programs would work a particular hardship for middle income students at all types of

institutions. Roughly 20 percent of those students now receiving Pell grants could become ineligible and as many as 60 percent of those students now receiving National Direct Student Loans and College Work Study on some campuses could become ineligible for this assistance due to the proposed income ceilings.

MEDICARE

The Medicare program is the cornerstone of this nation's commitment to adequate health care for 27 million aged and 3 million disabled persons. The Medicare program is the single most important Federal program protecting older Americans from financial hardship due to age or major illness. Despite recent Congressional reforms to increase cost-sharing and to bring program costs under control, Medicare is once again the victim of the Reagan budget ax. Unfortunately, it will be the elderly who will bear the brunt of the burden.

In his FY 1986 budget proposal, President Reagan has proposed a total of \$3.9 billion in Medicare reductions, in addition to the \$332 million in the fiscal year 1985 Medicare savings passed by Congress in 1984. The total Medicare savings in the FY 1986 budget is \$4.2 billion. These reductions will come in the form of legislative and regulatory changes. The most significant reductions requested by the President include an extension of the physical fee freeze which began on July 1, 1984 and a freeze on Medicare reimbursement rates for hospitals, and skilled nursing facilities. Additionally, the President, has proposed that the out-of-pocket costs which Medicare beneficiaries must pay for Part B premiums, deductibles and co-payments for home health services be increased.

Part B is the portion of Medicare which pays for physician and other medical services, including x-rays and diagnostic tests; outpatient services and home health care. Additionally, the Administration proposes to begin Medicare coverage on the first day of the month following the month in which age 65 is achieved. This proposal will mean that many seniors will have to go an additional month without the financial security of Medicare coverage.

To achieve this projected cost savings in the Medicare program, the elderly will be once again be asked to reach into their pockets. The President's proposals would shift nearly \$700 million in additional costs to the most vulnerable segment of our population. Beginning in 1986, monthly premiums for Part B would increase from \$15.50 per month to \$16.60 for month. The premium would continue to rise by two percentage points each year until 1990.

Due to recent Congressional reforms in the Medicare program, our senior citizens are caught up in a Catch 22 situation where the right to health care is no longer an option many of them can afford. Medicare is the only health insurance program most older Americans have. Nevertheless, Medicare covers only about 45 percent of their total day-to-day medical expenses. For Ohio, and the Cleveland Metropolitan area in particular, the President's proposals will result in severe financial hardship for a significant number of people. In the Cleveland metropolitan area, nearly 72,000 or roughly 13 percent of the population is 65 or older. Moreover, 3 out of 10 people admitted to Cleveland area hospitals are Medicare recipients.

The average Medicare beneficiary receives \$284.30 per month for social security. The average daily hospital cost is \$245.00. For

many low-income elderly, faced with delays in inflation adjustments in social security, cutbacks in housing, and food stamp programs, and rising utility costs, increased Medicare deductibles and co-payments may force many elderly citizens to forego some other basic necessity.

In addition to the elderly, hospitals in the Cleveland area will be faced with added financial pressures as a result of the President's proposals. Currently, 5 hospitals (Cleveland Metro General, Mt. Sinai, St. Lukes, University Hospitals, and St. Vincent's Charity Hospital) in the Cleveland metropolitan area provide 90 percent of all medical indigent care services rendered in Cuyahoga County. All of these hospitals are located in the 21st Congressional district. In 1984, the total cumulative cost of uncompensated care provided by these institutions was more than \$65 million. The added financial burden which will be placed on our elderly population because of the President's policies, will almost certainly be felt by these hospitals, as more and more Medicare beneficiaries become unable to afford the increased cost of the program.

Additionally, the President's budget proposal to freeze hospital reimbursements and his refusal to even offer any financial compensation to hospitals that serve significant numbers of the medically indigent, may threaten their very existence. No one would argue that hospitals must share in bringing down the costs of health care. However, hospitals should not be forced to make the choice of serving the health care needs of the poor or keeping their doors open.

MEDICAID

The Medicaid program helps States to pay for medical services for the poor. The Medicaid program is the largest federal health program for poor mothers and children. In fiscal year 1985, the program is expected to provide services for nearly 24 million persons, including 11 million children. For these individuals, the Medicaid program is the only way to pay for check-ups, medical treatment, dental care, hospitalization and needed drugs. Additionally, for several hundred thousand pregnant women, the program pays for prenatal and delivery services.

The rising cost of the Medicaid program has placed a strain on both federal and state budgets. Since 1981, nearly every state in the nation has been forced to place limits on the number of mothers who can qualify for Medicaid.

In recent years, the State of Ohio has not only been forced to accept federal reductions in the Medicaid program but has had to trim its own budget as well. Since 1982, 84,000 people have lost Medicaid benefits in Ohio, including 50,000 children.

President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget proposals include \$1.1 billion in Medicaid reductions in fiscal year 1986 and \$6.5 billion over fiscal years 1986-88. The reductions in the Medicaid program would be achieved by placing a cap on federal matching payments to states. Under the cap, Medicaid spending would increase by only 3 percent in fiscal year 1986 over last year's spending. This small rate of increase in federal reimbursements is well below the rate of medical care cost inflation. States would have increased flexibility to adjust their programs to meet lower federal reimbursements.

In Ohio, 144,500 persons are eligible for Medicaid. However, only 70,000 persons or 49 percent, are being served. The President's proposal to cap federal payments to the states will have a severe impact on Ohio,

particularly the 21st Congressional district. Of all Ohio Medicaid recipients, 17 percent live in the Cleveland area.

According to officials at the Ohio Department of Public Welfare, the state projects that in fiscal year 1986 a 14 percent increase over last year's Medicaid expenditures will be necessary to meet the needs of Medicaid recipients. If the President's proposal is approved, by mid-1986, the state of Ohio will experience a \$40 to \$50 million shortfall for Medicaid. This shortfall would force the state to trim Medicaid eligibility, reduce services and take other actions to limit Medicaid expenditures.

Moreover, Medicaid law authorizes states to pay premiums for certain low-income elderly in the Medicare program. With the President's proposal to increase out-of-pocket expenses for the elderly, an additional financial burden may be shifted to the Medicaid program if a significant number of seniors become unable to pay for the costs of their Medicare Part B premiums. Under this scenario, a significant amount of the burden will be felt in the 21st district where nearly 13 percent of the population is 65 or older.

FAMILY PLANNING

Family planning (Title 10) is the primary voluntary family planning program funded by the federal government. The program provides over 50 percent of available federal support for family planning services and the national network of family planning agencies through which all subsidized services are provided. The goal of the program has been to serve a population of nearly 11 million women at risk of unintended pregnancy. This includes 5 million adolescent women ages 15 to 19 and 6 million adult women ages 20 to 44 in families with incomes below 200 percent of poverty. Services include physical exams, contraception, counseling, cancer detection, health and social service referral, and community education.

As a direct result of the federally funded family planning program, in 1981 alone, more than 800,000 unintended pregnancies—about half of them among teenagers—were averted. If these unplanned pregnancies had occurred, there would have been an estimated 282,000 additional births and 433,000 more abortions that year. In the State of Ohio, family planning saves \$5.30 in taxpayers dollars for every \$1.00 of public funds invested.

Despite the apparent need for family planning services nationwide, the Reagan Administration has consistently taken actions to erode funding for the program. In fiscal years 1982 through 1985, President Reagan proposed to repeal the family planning program as a categorical grant program and place it in a block grant. Each time the Congress has rejected the Administration's proposals. In spite of past Congressional objections to his policies in this area, President Reagan has again, in his FY 1986 budget, proposed to consolidate family planning activities into a primary health block grant. Budget authority for the primary block grant would be set at \$550 million. In addition to family planning services, the block grant would include, black lung clinics and migrant and community health centers. Taking inflation into account, this amount results in a net 3 percent reduction in funding for these programs.

In FY 1984, Cuyahoga County spent roughly \$670,000 in federal funds for family planning and served over 25,000 women,

most of them low-income teenagers. For FY 1985 the County expects to receive \$539,200 in federal family planning funds, 17 percent below the FY 1984 amount. If the President's FY 1986 proposals are successful, nearly 3,700 low-income patients would have to be dropped from the program over the next two years. For many of these women, denied access to the program will most likely result in an unintended and unwanted pregnancy. Moreover, the Cleveland area has one of the highest teenage pregnancy and infant mortality rates in the nation. If Mr. Reagan has his way, what is now a national problem may become a local tragedy.

HEALTH MANPOWER EDUCATION AND TRAINING

One critical health manpower program marked for extinction by the Reagan Administration is the National Health Service Corps (NHSC) Scholarship Program. The NHSC was established in 1970 to help eliminate the maldistribution of medical personnel throughout the U.S. Students participating in the program exchange their future medical services to medically underserved communities for scholarships paying tuition and a monthly stipend. The National Health Service Corps Scholarship program has afforded medical students, a great many of them disadvantaged minorities, a unique opportunity to develop their professional talents, and then offers them the chance to provide medical services in their own communities.

Since its inception, the NHSC has experienced remarkable success, particularly through physician placements in community health centers. In communities served by these health centers, child immunizations have increased by as much as 50 percent, hospitalizations decreased by 60 percent and the incidence of preventable diseases has declined dramatically. The NHSC has been cost-efficient as well. For every \$1 spent on prenatal care, an estimated \$4 to \$6 is saved on newborn intensive-care costs. Despite the well documented effectiveness of the National Health Service Corps, the President has proposed no funding for new scholarships in his FY 1986 budget.

Currently there are 105 NHSC practitioners in the State of Ohio. Nearly 50 percent of the state's total are providing health care services at community health centers in the Cleveland area. In 1984, over 39,000 medically needy and poor residents sought medical and dental services from NHSC physicians and dentists practicing at the Hough Norwood Community Health Center. For communities with significant numbers of poor and underserved individuals, the President's decision to terminate the NHSC scholarship program will severely affect their ability to continually ensure that accessible and affordable health care is available to all in need.

Additionally, President Reagan has proposed to eliminate federal assistance for students pursuing careers in the health professions. Financial assistance is provided for health professionals and nurses under Titles 7 and 8 of the Public Health Service Act. For FY 1986, the Administration projects it will save nearly \$210 million for this purpose.

Today, the cost of an education is simply out of reach for most Americans and federal assistance has become increasingly necessary as the costs of medical education continue to rise. Recent projections indicate that students graduating from some private medical schools in 1985 will have accumulated debts of \$50,000 to \$60,000, and that by 1986 debts of \$40,000 will be typical of all

students graduating from both public and private schools.

Moreover, with sky-rocketing medical school costs, federal financial aid programs have been extremely important toward ensuring that equal opportunities for access to a medical education is available to students from every socioeconomic stratum. Moreover, the continuation of medical education assistance is particularly important to well qualified disadvantaged and minority students who would otherwise be denied this opportunity simply because they lack the necessary financial resources.

The 21st Congressional District includes one of the greatest concentrations of outstanding health professions schools and health facilities anywhere in America. Any proposal to reduce or repeal financial aid for health professions students attending these colleges or universities may result in significant decreases in enrollment.

Since 1983, the federal government has provided no new funds for the Health Professions Student Loan (HPSL) Program and an increased number of students have had to look to the more expensive guaranteed loan programs for support. However, schools have been allowed to use the funds that have been repaid by former students to offer new loans to incoming students.

At Case Western Reserve University (CWRU), which has one of the finest medical and dental schools in the area, over half of the students receive some type of financial assistance. Last year, 43 students received loans from the HPSL Program for a total \$168,000. Without any additional revenue, the elimination of the HPSL Program would result in the depletion of the school's HPSL loan fund and fewer financially needy and minority health professions students would receive aid. For the nursing school at CWRU, the elimination of funding for nurse education and training would have an even greater impact. Of a total enrollment of 309 students, 145 students receive financial aid. The President proposals would result in the loss of over \$650,000 in aid for the nursing school.

AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The Aid To Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) Program provides cash assistance to low-income families with children, primarily single parents. About 3.7 million families currently receive AFDC benefits, but these families represent only a fraction of all poor families. AFDC payments average only about \$24 a week per person nationally.

During the past four years, about 725,000 families lost AFDC benefits entirely due to budget reductions initiated by the Reagan Administration. Federal expenditures for AFDC program were reduced by more than \$2 billion during the period.

For FY 1986, the Reagan Administration again plans to reduce AFDC benefit expenditures by about \$271 million or 3%. These budget "savings" would be offset by \$145 million in increased administrative costs associated with the Administration proposed program changes for a net AFDC budget cut of \$126 million. In order to achieve budget savings, the Administration proposes four program changes which are identical or similar to proposals already considered and rejected by Congress. They include:

Requiring employable AFDC recipients to work or participate in job training programs; all AFDC applicants should be required for jobs.

Requiring single minor parents to live with their parents to be eligible for AFDC benefits.

Denying AFDC benefits to employable parent or relative caring for children when the youngest child reaches 16.

Establishing a state administrative block grant for costs of administering AFDC and other welfare programs.

In Cuyahoga County, about 119,000 parents and children receive AFDC benefits each month. Most are 21st District residents and all "employable" parents would be affected by the Administration's welfare proposals. An uncertain number of beneficiaries would be affected by the other proposed AFDC program changes.

LEGAL SERVICES

For the fifth consecutive year, President Reagan has proposed to terminate the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) at a time when the need for the LSC has never been higher. With the number of families in poverty at record high numbers, more and more people are in need of assistance for the often desperate legal problems that can accompany poverty. In the 21st District, more than 100,000 persons, or 20 percent of the total population of the 21st District, have incomes below the poverty line and qualify for services funded by the LSC. Currently, the Legal Services Corporation receives \$305 million in federal support and provides vital funding to the Legal Aid Society in Cleveland.

If President Reagan's FY 1986 budget proposal is approved, the Legal Aid Society in Cleveland would lose \$1.7 million in resources needed to assist low-income citizens with such every day problems as tenant-landlord disputes, social security disability payment terminations and consumer protection issues. Under the President's budget, the Legal Aid Society would be forced to lay off more than 15 lawyers who together handle more than 3,000 cases each year. This lost capacity to help poor and disadvantaged citizens in the 21st District translates into a profound and direct denial of essential services to needy clients.

MASS TRANSIT

Urban mass transit programs throughout the nation would be severely affected by Administration budget proposals which would slash federal funding for Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) programs. The FY 1986 budget includes only \$1.127 for federal assistance for mass transit programs compared with a FY 1985 appropriation of \$3.382 billion. In slashing the federal mass transit budget by nearly three-fourths, President Reagan would abolish mass transit operating assistance grants and discretionary capital grants. Additionally, interstate transfer transit grants (grants obtained in substitution for old I-490 projects) would be funded under the program previously reserved for substitute highway projects.

To replace these programs, a scaled-back formula capital assistance program, financed by the one cent gasoline tax dedicated to transit, would be funded at \$1.1 billion, with an increased local matching requirement of 30 percent.

The President's proposals would completely alter the current structure of federal mass transit programs established in 1982 and revoke the historical federal commitment to mass transit. These proposals would impair the ability of urban cities, such as Cleveland, to maintain a high degree of mo-

bility for their residents and sustain economic vitality and growth.

For FY 1985, Cleveland's Regional Transit Authority (RTA) will receive at least \$30 million in federal resources to operate and maintain rapid transit services in Cleveland. Under the President's budget, RTA would lose nearly 50 percent of this aid, including \$11 million for operating assistance and at least \$6 million in formula and discretionary capital grants. Additional dollars could be lost in FY 1986 depending upon RTA's success in competing for interstate transfer Transit grants. Major capital investment projects that would be jeopardized by the Administration proposals include the rehabilitation of the Red Line from Burke Airport to Windemere; improvements to the Terminal Tower station, and planned bus replacement. The drastic cut in federal operating subsidies, comprising 10-11 percent of RTA's total operating budget, would force either fare increases, service reductions or some combination of these actions to offset the sudden and striking loss of vital federal resources.

AMTRAK

Amtrak, which provides passenger rail service largely in the Northeast and the Midwest, would receive no federal funding in FY 1986 under President Reagan's FY 1986 budget. In FY 1985, Amtrak received \$684 million in federal subsidies.

If Congress approves a termination of federal support to Amtrak, it is expected that Amtrak would have to declare bankruptcy on October 1, 1985. This would mean the termination of Amtrak's Lake Shore Limited rail service to Cleveland with terminal points in Boston, New York, and Chicago. The Lake Shore Limited services 40,000 Cleveland area riders annually.

Amtrak also buys about \$1.3 million in goods and services annually from Cleveland area businesses. Thus, the Cleveland area economy would lose this source of revenue if Amtrak is forced to shut down due to the loss of its federal subsidy.

HOUSING

The Federal government currently provides housing assistance to over six million households. This broad undertaking reflects the national housing policy which Congress adopted in 1949 and has reaffirmed in successive amendments to the Housing Act. In that Act, Congress stated that a decent and safe living environment should be provided to every American family as soon as possible.

Over the last 12 years, Congress has provided \$86 billion in housing assistance through the Farmers Home Administration (FHMA) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) toward the goal of providing housing to those who are not ordinarily accommodated by the private market. This year, however, the Administration, through its FY 1986 budget proposals for HUD and FMHA would impose a moratorium on producing new units of federally subsidized housing and would terminate the FMHA housing assistance programs. In 1988, after the end of the proposed moratorium, the Administration plans to split federal allocations for new assisted housing units between rural and urban areas.

If Congress approves a two year housing moratorium the city of Cleveland would suffer the loss of at least 1,395 units of subsidized housing and probably more. About \$14 million normally received by the City for planning and development purposes would also be lost. The city of Cleveland es-

timates its housing losses under the President's budget to include the following:

70 units under the Section 202 Elderly/Handicapped Housing Program;

200 units under the Rental Rehabilitation Grant Program;

50 units under the Housing Development Action Grant;

300 units under the Public Housing Modernization Program;

75 units under the Section 312 Program;

200 units under Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program; and

500 units under the Section 8 Existing Housing Program.

The Administration contends that these cuts are necessary in order to reduce the deficit and reform the delivery of Federal housing assistance. However, a freeze on housing development programs will mean that the 100,000 housing units which historically have been produced each year nationwide will not be available to mitigate the effects of an annual loss of 350,000 units from the marketplace because they are either substandard or have been demolished.

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING SUBSIDIES

The Reagan Administration proposes an appropriation of \$1.0 billion to pay operating subsidies to public housing agencies (PHA's) in FY 1986. This amount is 20% below the \$1.4 billion appropriation for this purpose in FY 1985. Although Congress approved these funds to pay 100% of the entitlement amount due PHA's under HUD's Performance Funding System, the Administration has asked Congress to rescind \$253 million of the \$1.4 billion appropriation based on the assumption that these funds will not be needed due to new regulations and projected energy cost savings.

In FY 1984, the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority received \$25 million in federal operating subsidy payments to maintain the 11,800 public housing units in Cleveland. Of this amount, about \$16 million was needed for utility payments, leaving only \$8 million to finance essential maintenance, security and other operational activities. Even with the federal subsidy and rental income, the CMHA experienced a deficit of \$3.5 million in FY 1984.

For FY 1985, CMHA expects to receive about \$24 million in federal subsidies, based on receiving 100 percent of its entitlement. If Congress approves the Administration's rescission proposal and public housing operating requirements are greater than expected, CMHA could experience a significant loss in federal resources. This could have a critical impact on CMHA's ability to provide services to its residents, since the Authority already anticipates an operating deficit of at least \$2 million in FY 1985.

A similar situation exists for FY 1986. According to the Council for Large Public Housing Authorities, about \$1.3 billion will be needed in FY 1986 to provide PHA's with 100 percent of their operating subsidy requirements. If the President Reagan's budget request of \$1.0 billion is approved, resulting in a 20 percent funding shortfall, PHA's across the country, including CMHA could face considerable difficulty in sustaining needed operations.

PUBLIC HOUSING MODERNIZATION

The President proposes a partial moratorium on the Public Housing Modernization Program for one year—FY 1986. During this year, the \$1.7 billion Public Housing Modernization Program would be replaced by a \$175 million Emergency Modernization

Needs Program. This represents a sharp reduction of 90 percent in funding for critical public housing modernization projects. The definition of emergency needs under the interim program has not yet been defined by the Administration. Therefore, it is not possible to determine how much of these funds will be distributed to CMHA. At a minimum, however, Cleveland should qualify for funds to meet emergency heating needs at the Carver Park development.

The impact of the moratorium upon Cleveland will mean that CMHA will not receive funds to upgrade 300 now vacant substandard units. A high vacancy rate means that CMHA will continue to lose valuable income. CMHA has performed a study which reveals that in order to bring all its units up to standard, CMHA should receive \$143 million in modernization funds. In FY 1984 CMHA received only \$2 million in modernization funds for the second stage funding of Old Cedar Homes in the 21st District. The funds will modernize 651 apartments.

COMMUNITY AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Included in the programs to be eliminated by the fiscal 1986 budget is the popular Urban Development Action Grant Program (UDAG). This program is administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development as part of its community planning and development efforts and was funded at \$444 million in FY 1985. UDAG grants leverage private sector money for urban and small city revitalization projects.

UDAG funds have been used in the 21st District to provide financing for businesses which have provided over 800 new permanent jobs, thereby refuting the Administration's contention that the program does not create new jobs. Indeed, the program has been a vehicle for the creation of jobs. Out of the total of the jobs brought to Cleveland through the UDAG program, 23 percent are held by minorities. The termination of this important economic development and job creation tool will mean a loss to Cleveland of an average of \$15 million a year in federal resources and an average private sector investment of \$75 million. The abolishment of the UDAG Program would also mean that potentially 3,200 new jobs may not be realized because future UDAG grants would be used by the City to attract and assist new businesses to either retool, or to relocate in the Cleveland area.

Coupled with the termination of the UDAG Program is the Administration's intention to reduce funding for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). The FY 1986 budget includes only \$3.1 billion for CDBG grants, down from the \$3.5 billion appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1985. These funds are used by City of Cleveland and local communities to fund a wide range of activities, such as the acquisition and disposition of real property, construction of public facilities, rehabilitation of housing and business properties, and the provision of public services. CDBG allocations made by the City for street improvements and public services would probably be cut at least 10 percent below current levels in FY 1986 as a result of the lower level of federal support.

Section 108, an important loan guarantee component of federal community development activities is slated for zero funds in FY 1986. The Section 108 programs allows the City to finance the costs of rehabilitation and acquisition of publicly-owned building over an extended period. The loss of this important loan guarantee program will mean

that \$1.2 million a year and 125 jobs will be lost to Cleveland. The Administration plans to make the FY 1986 zero funding request permanent by offering legislation to repeal Section 108.

EPA CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

This program provides grants to municipal agencies to assist in the construction of municipal waste water treatment plants. As a result of legislation enacted in 1981, the federal share for new projects has been reduced from 75 percent to 55 percent beginning in 1985. For FY 1986, the Administration again requests \$2.4 billion (the annual level of funding provided since 1982), but is also asking for legislation to phase out the program by 1990. Under the proposal, remaining appropriations would be dedicated to the completion by 1990 of 11 existing projects which are now under construction.

The rationale advanced for the elimination of federal sewage construction grants is that their original purpose has been eliminated: the backlog which existed in 1972 currently does not exist. Further, the Administration believes that the duty to treat local water supplies is a state and local responsibility. These arguments are strongly refuted by the statistics which describe the State of Ohio. In Ohio, the priority project list for cities applying for EPA construction grants is comprised of 632 communities. In fiscal year 1984, grants to 34 projects were disbursed. However, in fiscal year 1985, the projects receiving aid will be less than half those of 1984. Obviously, towns, such as Bedford, Ohio, in the 21st District—number 432 on Ohio EPA's list—would not be able to obtain more than \$7 million in resources needed to retrofit its existing plant for conformance with the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

Although the State of Ohio is now considering the establishment of a loan program to finance the difference between the costs financed by the federal government and the total amount required to build local sewage plants, the phase out of the federal program before the States have had the chance to establish a new financing structure could cause the reemergence of the backlog which existed in 1972. That backlog will certainly be greater than the 632 Ohio municipalities which are currently in need of assistance to build wastewater treatment facilities.

OFFICE OF REVENUE SHARING

The Administration seeks to phase out the General Revenue Sharing program on September 30, 1985, one year prior to the expiration of the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 which authorizes the distribution of \$4.6 billion annually to over 39,000 units of local government in FY 1984, 1985 and 1986. The Administration believes that general revenue sharing no longer meets the purpose for which it was originally proposed in the seventies. It states that many beneficiary local governments do not need the revenue assistance because they are now hold surpluses instead of the deficits they ran previously. Further, the Administration states that the redistributive effect is random and the formula does not benefit the states with the greatest need.

The funds are provided to local governments through a formula which reflects the income of the community. Relatively higher payments go to communities with high tax efforts and low per capita incomes. Therefore, the most generous per capita payments go to thousands of poor rural communities as well as to financially troubled major cities. The proponents of the general reve-

nue sharing program believe that it has made significant contributions toward reducing fiscal disparities between local governments receiving assistance.

The impact upon the 21st District of the termination of general revenue sharing would be a loss of \$12-13 million. These resources are particularly useful to local communities. For example, in Cleveland, revenue sharing funds have been used to pay for the following programs:

- \$2.9 million for fire programs, 21 percent of the City budget for fire programs;
- \$2.8 million for health programs, 10 percent of the City budget for health;
- \$620,000 for libraries, 100 percent of the City budget for library programs; and
- \$5.3 million for parks and recreation, 24 percent of the City's budget for this item.

The positive impact that revenue sharing has upon Cleveland is best demonstrated by the amount that it receives for the library system. Without revenue sharing dollars, the City would have had to raise the entire amount from the residents of the City in the form of additional taxes. If the Administration's request is honored by the Congress, then the prospect of local taxes rising to replace the lost revenue sharing dollars is a firm prospect.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION/ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

In the Budget for fiscal year 1986, the Administration intends to terminate funding for the Economic Development Administration and the Small Business Administration. Both programs have had a positive effect upon Cleveland and the 21st District.

The Economic Development Administration (EDA) which is funded through the Department of Commerce, has as major goals the stimulation of economic growth, the provision of permanent private sector jobs and the leveraging of private sector dollars. In order to accomplish its goals, the EDA utilizes industrial and commercial loans, provides technical assistance, and offers loan guarantees. Since 1965, EDA has used its resources to provide assistance to regions where advanced technology or foreign competition have caused severe economic distress, and where the businesses have moved taking jobs with them.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) is an independent agency in the Executive Branch. This agency offers to small business technical assistance, procurement information for the federal government, advocacy for the use of small business, research and technology, and also makes available a corps of retired executives for consultation.

Both the EDA and the SBA offer technical and financial assistance to businesses which are of sound value and, have sufficient resources to secure the repayment of the loans granted. The loans are made to firms which have tried to obtain funds from the private banks and have been turned down. In the case of the EDA, the borrower must have been turned down by two banks while SBA loan assistance is made available when the borrower either can not obtain funds or is unable to obtain the loan at a reasonable rate.

The Administration contends that the loan guarantees and loans made by both programs compete with private sector activities and therefore should be eliminated. The Administration further contends that neither program has created jobs at a reasonable cost and has created businesses which aid upper income groups. The Administration arguments are refuted by the statistics for the 21st District.

Combined funds of private sector, SBA and EDA have totaled over \$10 million in the 21st District. These funds have been used to create over 400 jobs by aiding firms in retail, manufacturing, and construction. For example, the funds from EDA have been used to develop the Midtown Industrial Park and the Cleveland Industrial Park. An important fact to note is that these jobs were created at a cost of \$4,000 per job, substantially under the Administration's estimated cost of \$20,000 per job in the EDA program.

The termination of these two programs will mean that nearly 150 jobs provided annually by SBA-assisted firms and 350 jobs created by EDA loans made on an annual basis will be lost to the City of Cleveland.●

INDIAN JUVENILE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and this Member are reintroducing the Indian Juvenile Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Act. We invite the attention and support of our colleagues in this very worthy effort.

For decades, researchers have documented the use and consequences of alcohol and drug abuse among Native Americans. Inevitably, stereotypes developed about Indian drinking, although the phenomenon began with the introduction of alcohol by early European explorers, who brought whiskey, horses, guns, and tools for trading purposes. While the reasons leading to such high rates of alcohol and drug abuse among Indian people are complex, most Indian and non-Indian researchers alike point to joblessness, dislocation from tribal homelands, decline in traditional culture and spirituality, and stresses on the family unit as being among the major causes of alcohol and drug abuse. Clearly, something needed to be done.

As a result, in November 1983, this Member and the gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. DASCHLE, began discussing the extensive problems of alcohol and drug abuse that we had observed among Indian youth on reservations in our own States and across the Nation. We discovered that alcohol-related illnesses and deaths among Indian people are considerably higher than among non-Indian people. On many reservations, alcohol plays a role in 95 percent of automobile fatalities. On some reservations, fetal alcohol syndrome occurs as frequently as 1 in 100 births, whereas its occurrence in non-Indian populations is approximately 1 in 700 births. Children born to alcoholic mothers are almost always retarded, and most suffer facial abnor-

malities and abnormalities to extremities. The use of inhalents, such as paint thinner and cleaning fluid, occurs among Indian young people at a rate almost twice as high as among non-Indian young people. The results of this use range from damage to the central nervous system to kidney failure. In addition, the vast majority of contract health care dollars—up to 70 percent—provided through Indian Health Service goes to treat alcohol and drug-related problems. Clearly such statistics demand a reassessment of the problem and a new, innovative approach.

Thus we set out to establish what was being done, and how effective those efforts were. Our investigations over the course of a year and a half revealed that of some 200 Indian Health Service alcohol treatment centers, only one or two of them addressed the needs of youth. Prevention and education programs were sporadic at best. And while no one would say that treatment of adult alcoholics should be reduced, we decided that the way to seriously combat the problem would be to develop a program that stressed prevention and taught prevention techniques to children from kindergarten age on up through high school graduation. Pursuing such a strategy, we decided, would provide a better opportunity to accomplish a permanent change over time in attitudes and self-concept.

The time has come to stop the insidious hold of alcohol and drugs on Indian communities. Our legislation will, we believe, complement tribal initiatives already under way by requiring alcohol and drug abuse prevention instruction in reservation schools. It represents a comprehensive assault on the problem—one that engages the resources of the tribes and the Federal Government as well. Our bill also provides alternatives to incarceration, where appropriate, for those young people picked up on alcohol and drug-related charges. Finally, it provides for the use of facilities now existing in Indian country for treatment and rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker and distinguished colleagues, we need your assistance. Our legislation is carefully crafted to secure bipartisan support. It is the product of months of consultation with Indian people, among them, health and education specialists. We would welcome inquiries about the measure, and hope that through discussions about the extent and tragic consequences of the problem, as well as through hearings, we will be able to build a strong case for a full-fledged prevention effort that will stop the useless waste of young lives and talent among Indian people.

I submit the full text and a section-by-section summary of the bill for printing in the RECORD at this point:

H.R. 1156

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 "Indian Juvenile Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Act".

TITLE I—INTERDEPARTMENTAL AGREEMENT

Sec. 101. (a) Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall agree by means of a memorandum of agreement to—

(1) coordinate the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Service alcohol and drug abuse programs existing on the date of enactment of this Act and programs established by this Act;

(2) identify Federal, State, local, and private resources to combat alcohol and drug abuse among Indians;

(3) delineate the responsibilities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to coordinate alcohol and drug abuse-related services at the central, area, agency, and service unit levels;

(4) determine the scope of the Indian juvenile alcohol and drug abuse problem and its estimated financial and human costs;

(5) authorize the Bureau of Indian Affairs agency superintendents and education superintendents and the Indian Health Service service unit directors to enter into agreements described in section 102; and

(6) provide for biannual review by the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Health and Human Services of the agreement under subsection (a).

(b)(1) The Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Health and Human Services shall consult with and solicit the comments of interested Indian tribes and Indian individuals and Indian organizations in developing the agreement under subsection (a).

(2) The agreement under subsection (a) shall be submitted to Congress and published in the Federal Register within 90 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 102. (a) At the request of any Indian tribe, the Bureau of Indian Affairs agency superintendent, the Bureau of Indian Affairs education superintendent, and the Indian Health Service service unit director for such tribe shall enter into an agreement with such tribe to coordinate resources and services related to alcohol and drug abuse prevention, identification, treatment, and follow-up care.

(b) Such agreement shall—

(1) identify the responsibilities and referral resources of all agencies and programs providing alcohol and drug abuse-related resources or services within such tribe's service area; and

(2) be modified semiannually to reflect changes in the availability of resources and services related to alcohol and drug abuse prevention, identification, education, treatment, and follow-up care.

Sec. 103. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Indian Health Service, shall bear equal responsibility for the implementation of this Act in cooperation with Indian tribes.

TITLE II—EDUCATION

Sec. 201. Section 304 of the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act (20 U.S.C. 241cc) is amended by—

(1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the training of counselors at schools eligible for funding under this title in counseling techniques relevant to alcohol and drug abuse."

Sec. 202. Section 423 of the Indian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 3385b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) 10 percent of the fellowships awarded under subsection (a) shall be awarded to persons who are receiving training in guidance counseling with a specialty in the area of alcohol and drug abuse counseling and education."

Sec. 203. Section 315(a) of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1211a(a)) is amended by—

(1) striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to provide alcohol and drug abuse counseling services to better enable Indians in need of such services to take advantage of educational and employment opportunities."

Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall require Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and schools operated under contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638) to provide a program of instruction regarding alcohol and drug abuse to students in kindergarten and grades one through twelve.

(b) Schools providing programs of instruction under subsection (a) are encouraged to emphasize family participation in such instruction.

Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) establish summer recreation and counseling programs for Indian youth on reservations;

(2) require such Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and schools operated under contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act as he determines to be necessary to remain open during the months of June, July, and August of each year to provide adequate facilities for such programs; and

(3) provide, as needed, salaried coordinators for such programs.

(b)(1) In addition to the facilities described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Interior is encouraged to use public facilities, other than those described in such subsection, and private facilities wherever possible for programs established under subsection (a)(1).

(2) Facilities which the Secretary may use under paragraph (1) shall be used under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the authority having jurisdiction over any such facility.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall coordinate any programs established under subsection (a)(1) with any other summer programs for Indian youth.

Sec. 206. The Secretary of Interior shall, within 120 days of the date of the enactment of this title, publish an alcohol and drug abuse newsletter in cooperation with the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education to report on Indian alcohol and drug abuse projects and programs. The newsletter shall be published

once in each calendar quarter and shall be circulated without charge to schools, tribal offices, Bureau of Indian Affairs agency and area offices, Indian Health Service area and service unit offices, Indian Health Service alcohol programs, and other entities providing alcohol and drug abuse-related services or resources to Indian people.

TITLE III—FAMILY AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Sec. 301. (a) Any training program for community health representatives funded under the Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13) shall include not less than two weeks of training on the problems of alcohol and drug abuse and shall include instruction in crisis intervention, family relations, and the causes and effects of fetal alcohol syndrome.

(b)(1) The Director of the Indian Health Service shall, either directly or through contract, make available training on the problems of alcohol and drug abuse, including instruction in crisis intervention, family relations, and the causes and effects of fetal alcohol syndrome to—

(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs Superintendent of Education (or his designee);

(B) the Bureau of Indian Affairs Agency Superintendent (or his designee);

(C) Indian Health Service service unit directors;

(D) Bureau of Indian Affairs social workers;

(E) Indian Health Service doctors, nurses, nurse's aides, and paramedical personnel;

(F) Bureau of Indian Affairs school personnel;

(G) personnel of schools operated under contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act; and

(H) supervisors of emergency shelters established under section 402(c) of this Act.

(2) The Director of the Indian Health Service shall also offer, upon request, the training described in paragraph (1) to—

(A) members of school boards governing—
(i) schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(ii) schools operated under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

(iii) public schools on or near Indian reservations and public schools in Oklahoma, Alaska, and California with significant numbers of Indian students;

(B) members of parent advisory committees of Bureau of Indian Affairs schools;

(C) members of child welfare protection committees serving Indian communities;

(D) educators at Tribal colleges which do not otherwise provide alcohol and drug abuse training to their personnel;

(E) Urban Indian Center counselors;

(F) home-school-liaison personnel funded under the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act;

(G) Tribal Council members;

(H) Tribal court judges;

(I) Administrators of the Women, Infants and Children Program operated by the Department of Agriculture;

(J) personnel of public schools on or near Indian reservations and public schools in Oklahoma, Alaska, and California with significant numbers of Indian students; and

(K) any interested member of the Indian community.

(c) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, upon request, provide certification to any person who completes training under this title for the purposes of obtaining academic credit or certification at any post-secondary educational institution.

TITLE IV—LAW ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. The Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall, in the training of Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement personnel, provide education on the problem of alcohol and drugs among the Indian juveniles.

Sec. 402. (a)(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), any tribal, Federal, or Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement officer who arrests an Indian juvenile for any offense related to the abuse of alcohol or drugs shall, in lieu of incarceration, place such juvenile in a temporary emergency shelter described in subsection (c) or a community-based alcohol or drug abuse treatment facility to the extent such facilities are available.

(2) Paragraph (1) and any regulation promulgated under paragraph (3) of this subsection shall not supersede any tribal law.

(3) The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Attorney General of the United States, shall promulgate guidelines under which a law enforcement officer may place an Indian juvenile arrested for an offense related to the abuse of alcohol or drugs in a facility other than an emergency shelter described in subsection (c) for the benefit of the Indian juvenile or the safety of the community.

(b) In the case of any State which exercises criminal jurisdiction over any part of Indian country under section 1162 of title 18 of the United States Code or section 401 of the Act of April 11, 1968 (25 U.S.C. 1321), such State is urged to require its law enforcement officers to—

(1) place any Indian juvenile arrested for any offense related to the abuse of alcohol or drugs in a temporary emergency shelter described in subsection (c) or a community-based alcohol or drug abuse treatment facility in lieu of incarceration to the extent such facilities are available; and

(2) observe the guidelines promulgated under subsection (a)(3).

(c)(1) The Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall establish a program and approve a compensation schedule under which households of Indian families will be compensated to serve as temporary emergency shelters for Indian juveniles apprehended by any law enforcement officer for offenses related to the abuse of alcohol or drugs.

(2) No emergency shelter established under a program established under paragraph (1) shall commence operation until—

(A) the tribal council of any tribe to be served by such shelter approves such shelter; and

(B) such shelter meets the licensing requirements promulgated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under paragraph (3).

(3)(A) The Bureau of Indian Affairs shall, within 120 days of the date of enactment of this paragraph, promulgate standards by which the emergency shelters established under a program under paragraph (1) shall become licensed.

(B) Such standards shall require that any individual supervising such shelter have completed the training described in section 301(b)(1) of this Act.

(4) The costs of construction of any emergency shelter are not authorized by this Act.

TITLE V—JUVENILE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION

Sec. 501. The Director of the Indian Health Service shall, within 6 months of the date of enactment of this Act, conduct a study to determine—

(1) the size of the juvenile Indian population in need of residential alcohol and drug abuse treatment;

(2) where facilities to provide such treatment are or should be located; and

(3) the cost of providing such treatment.

Sec. 502. (a) The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide a program of comprehensive alcohol and drug abuse treatment services, including detoxification and counseling services, and follow-up care in Indian Health Service facilities and in facilities operated under contract under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to Indian juveniles and adults in need of such services.

(b) No health facility described in subsection (a) shall be required under this section to provide inpatient services if such facility is primarily an outpatient facility.

(c) The Director shall report on the progress of the program provided under subsection (a) to relevant committees of the Congress within 18 months after the completion of the study described in section 501.

Sec. 503. (a)(1) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, in consultation with the Indian Health Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, identify and utilize wherever possible existing federally owned structures suitable for use as residential alcohol and drug abuse treatment centers for Indian juveniles to meet the needs identified in the study under section 501.

(2) Any structure described in paragraph (1) may be used under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the agency having responsibility for the structure.

(3) The Secretary of Health and Human Services may, directly or by contract, renovate any facility described in paragraph (1). Any such renovation shall conform with such terms and conditions as have been agreed upon under paragraph (2).

(b) The Secretary of Interior shall identify for the Secretary of Health and Human Services any existing Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities which could be utilized for residential alcohol and drug abuse treatment centers for Indian juveniles.

(c) If there is not an adequate number of facilities which may be renovated under subsection (a)(3) to meet the treatment needs identified in the study under section 501, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall seek specific authority to construct such facilities as he finds necessary to meet such treatment needs.

TITLE VI—DEFINITIONS, EFFECTIVE DATE, AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 601. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(1) "Indian tribe" means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community of Indians, including any Alaskan Native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601, et. seq.) which is recognized as eligible for special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians;

(2) "Indian" means any person who is a member of an Indian tribe;

(3) "juvenile" means any Indian under the age of 18;

(4) "service unit" means an administrative entity within the Indian Health Service serving one or more Indian tribes within a

geographical area defined by regulation by the Indian Health Service;

(5) "service area" means the geographical area served by a service unit;

(6) "Indian Health Service area office" means an administrative entity within the Indian Health Service through which services and funds are provided to service units within a geographical area defined by regulation by the Indian Health Service;

(7) "Bureau of Indian Affairs area office" means an administrative entity within the Bureau of Indian Affairs through which funds and services are provided to agency offices within a geographical area defined by regulation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs; and

(8) "agency office" means an administrative entity within the Bureau of Indian Affairs serving one or more Indian tribes within a geographical area defined by regulation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Sec. 602. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act shall become effective October 1, 1985.

(b) Titles I and VI and section 402(b)(3) of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of the Act.

Sec. 603. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 to carry out the amendments in title II, the provisions of titles III and IV and the study in section 501 of this Act.

(b) There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as Congress determines to be necessary to carry out sections 502 and 503 of this Act after taking into consideration the findings of the study conducted pursuant to section 501.

SUMMARY OF JUVENILE INDIAN ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION ACT

Section 101. Memorandum of Agreement to be made between Secretaries of Interior and Health and Human Services to coordinate programs and delineate responsibilities dealing with the prevention, identification, treatment and follow-up care of alcohol and drug abuse. Memorandum will include authority for agency level BIA Superintendents and IHS Service Unit Directors to enter into agreements with tribes regarding alcohol and drug abuse efforts.

Section 102. At the request of a tribe, IHS Service Unit Director and BIA Superintendent will enter into agreement with the tribe to coordinate programs dealing with the prevention, identification, treatment and follow-up care of alcohol and drug abuse.

Sections 201, 202 and 203. Amend the Indian Education Act to:

(a) include as Part A eligible activities drug and alcohol abuse counselling

(b) earmark in Part B fellowships a 10% setaside of fellowships for people pursuing degrees in counselling with an emphasis on alcohol and drug abuse counselling

(c) include as Part C eligible activities alcohol and drug abuse counselling

Section 204. Require all BIA and Contract schools to provide alcohol and drug education in grades K-12.

Section 205. Secretary of the Interior shall establish summer recreation and counselling programs for youth on reservations. Shall require, as necessary, BIA and Contract schools to remain open in the summer for these programs. Secretary may enter into agreements to keep public and nonpublic facilities open in the summer for youth programs. The Secretary may, as needed, provide for salaries coordinators for summer youth programs.

Section 206. Secretary of Interior shall publish, in cooperation with the Secretaries

of Education and HHS, a quarterly alcohol and drug abuse newsletter reporting on tribal alcohol and drug abuse projects and programs. Publication shall be circulated free of charge.

Section 301(a). Community Health Representatives shall receive not less than two weeks training in alcohol and drug abuse, including instruction in crisis intervention, family relations and fetal alcohol syndrome.

Section 301(b)(1). IHS shall provide, directly or through contract, alcohol and drug abuse training to the following people: BIA Education Superintendents, BIA Agency Superintendents, IHS Service Unit Directors, BIA social workers, IHS doctors, nurses, nurses' aides and paramedics, BIA school personnel, Contract school personnel, and supervisors of emergency shelters.

Section 301(b)(2). IHS shall offer, directly or through contract, alcohol and drug abuse training to the following people: BIA, Contract and public school boards personnel (on or near reservations, including Oklahoma, Alaska and California), parent advisory committee members, child welfare protection committee members, Urban Indian Center counsellors, home-school liaison personnel funded under the Indian Education Act, tribal college educators (unless the college already offers this service to its employees), tribal council members, tribal court judges, WIC personnel, public school personnel on or near reservations (including Oklahoma, Alaska and California) and other interested community members.

Section 301(c). The Secretary of HHS shall provide certification for completed alcohol training for the purpose of obtaining academic credit at post-secondary institutions.

Section 401. The BIA shall provide, as part of its training for law enforcement personnel, education regarding alcohol and drug abuse.

Section 402(a) (1), (2) and (3). Indian juveniles arrested by federal, BIA or tribal law enforcement officers shall, when possible, be placed in emergency shelters or other facilities in lieu of incarceration. The Department of Interior shall establish guidelines for placement of youths in non-jail facilities. No guidelines or regulations can supersede tribal laws.

Section 402(b) (1) and (2). Where states exercise criminal jurisdiction in Indian country, law enforcement personnel are encouraged to place juveniles in emergency shelters or other facilities in lieu of incarceration. States are encouraged to follow regulations established by the Secretary of Interior regarding placement of juveniles.

Section 402(c) (1) (2), (3), and (4). The BIA is directed to establish a program to compensate families to serve as temporary emergency shelters for juveniles apprehended for alcohol and drug related offenses. Emergency shelters must meet BIA licensing requirements and be approved by tribal councils. Supervisors of emergency shelters shall have training in alcohol and drug abuse. No emergency shelter construction costs are authorized by this bill.

Section 501. IHS shall, within 6 months, provide a report to Congress on the size of the juvenile Indian population in need of residential alcohol or drug treatment, where such facilities should be located and the cost of providing such treatment.

Section 502. IHS shall provide comprehensive alcohol and drug treatment services, including detoxification, counselling and follow-up care.

Section 503. The Secretary of HHS, in consultation with the Directors of IHS and

BIA, shall identify possible buildings that can be used as juvenile Indian alcohol/drug abuse residential treatment facilities. The Secretary of HHS is given the authority to renovate facilities, either directly or by contract, so that they may be used as juvenile treatment facilities. The Secretary of Interior shall make known any BIA facility suitable for juvenile treatment purposes. If not enough existing facilities are available, the Secretary of HHS shall seek authority to construct residential alcohol and drug treatment facilities for Indian juveniles.

□ 1440

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

THE DISPUTED ELECTION IN THE EIGHTH DISTRICT OF INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to talk about the case of the people of Indiana and Rick McIntyre, who won election in Indiana, and the problem we have in getting the people of Indiana adequate representation in the Congress and the very grave danger to this congressional system from the policies which have been followed by the Democratic leadership in not seating Mr. McIntyre.

The case is very simple. On election night Mr. McIntyre won the election in Indiana. Because of a mathematical error in counting the precincts twice by a Democratic judge in one particular county, for a brief period of time it appeared that the Democratic incumbent, Mr. McCloskey, had won, but in fact there was a mathematical error which was discovered, and when the votes were counted accurately, the secretary of state of Indiana concluded that Mr. McIntyre had won by 34 votes—a narrow victory, but nonetheless a victory.

The secretary of state of Indiana certified that Mr. McIntyre had won and sent the certificate to the House of Representatives, and on the day this Congress was convened the Clerk of the House reported that Mr. McIntyre had won, and indeed on the vote for Speaker Mr. McIntyre voted. Only after the vote for Speaker did the Democratic leadership move to stop Mr. McIntyre and to force him to stand to one side.

This is an unprecedented step. There were claims that there was confusion, that the 34 votes were too narrow, and that in fact there had to be a recount. Interestingly, the Democratic incumbent who had been defeated, Mr. McCloskey, did not file under the Federal Elections Act and did not seek to make a case and in fact behaved as though he had been defeated. But here on the House floor the Democratic leadership decided to do something which constitutionally is unprecedented, to stop the people of Indiana from having their Representative, even though the secretary of state of Indiana had certified that he had won.

A recount was underway. So without doing more than protesting with our votes and speaking out, we stood to one side for approximately 1 month, and when the recount was over, under Indiana law, in 15 counties, following the procedures of Indiana law, with Democrats in a majority of the recount situations being in charge, because they have local control, not only did Mr. McIntyre win the recount but he won by a larger margin; that is, he went from 34 votes ahead of Mr. McCloskey, the Democrat who had been defeated, to 418 votes ahead of Mr. McCloskey, the Democrat who had been defeated.

Once the recount was done, it was clear. There were no mathematical errors. They had carefully and scrupulously followed Indiana law. They had taken the steps necessary to prevent cheating, and they had taken the steps necessary to prevent the voting of ballots which may have been cast by fraud. They had done precisely what Indiana requires, and at that point Mr. McIntyre's margin had gone up to 418 votes. And yet on the last day we were in session before the Presidential holidays recess, this House voted, with only five Democrats voting to follow the Constitution, with only five Democrats voting to seat the man who had won the election and the recount.

Why did only five Democrats cross the line? I think there are two reasons. First, many good, decent Democrats have been misled by their leadership and have been told things which are simply not correct, and, second, many Democrats are afraid because some very powerful Democrats have put their prestige, indeed possibly their careers, on the line in an effort to take a seat which the people of Indiana have voted not to give to the Democratic incumbent.

We stand then today in a very unprecedented and a very dangerous situation. We stand in a situation in which for the first time in American history the people of a congressional district are being denied representation while a task force looks at the election.

Now, let me make very clear that there is nothing wrong with the task

force looking at the election. I serve on the House Administration Committee, and I think when there is any question, we ought to investigate the elections and we ought to make sure the correct persons are seated. But historically, if the State government certifies that a member has won an election, if the State government is willing to put its honor and its prestige on the line and say, "We believe we have counted these votes honestly, and we believe Mr. McIntyre has won," historically we always seat the winner while looking at the election.

The reason for that is very simple. If we establish the precedent in this House that 218 Members can decide to deny an election winner and set him or her to one side and say, "We are not going to seat you while we decide some other things," and then go through long, complicated counting procedures and through the difficulties of staff work and for a variety of reasons drag it out—and, after all, the people of Indiana are now into their second month with inadequate representation—then the people of the Eighth District of Indiana have not been represented for the first 7 weeks of this Congress and they are literally being taxed without representation. That is precisely what the American Revolution was about.

This could drag on for months, with a truly clever political machine willing to place its own partisan interests above the Nation and above the Constitution. They could drag out a recount for 4, 5, or 6 months and could find all sorts of reasons to dispute it. And I have been told there is some dispute about what the Democrats were told on the day on which we voted. Some people suggested that within 45 days the work of the task force could be done. Others suggested that by April 30, a far longer period than 45 days, the task force's work could be done, and that is without any complications.

□ 1450

Now, we are not suggesting that the people on the task force are not trying to be sincere and to be dedicated and to be good citizens. What we are suggesting is that the task force could continue its policies while Mr. McIntyre was seated, that seating Mr. McIntyre would provide representation for the people of Indiana based upon the Indiana secretary of state certification, based on the election count and the recount, and that during the period the task force was meeting, at least the people of Indiana would have all their voices, rather than being one short and the people of the Eighth District would have their voice instead of being unrepresented.

Now, this opinion is not a partisan Republican opinion. Very sincere and very competent Democrats who have looked at this issue, five of them, took

the very courageous risk of turning aside their party whip and voting against their party's leadership, an act for which some of them may indeed be punished ultimately, an act of great courage, because the pressures were enormous.

The Washington Post, hardly a Republican newspaper, on February 11 wrote an editorial entitled, "A Seat for Mr. McIntyre." I want to quote it, because the Washington Post is a liberal newspaper normally and normally not a newspaper that goes out of its way to be decisively helpful to Republicans, but it is a newspaper which has looked at this issue and which has come to the conclusion, which I think every Member of this House should look at.

On the day the 99th Congress convened, a cloud remained over the election results in Indiana's 8th District. Incumbent Democrat Frank McCloskey appeared to be the victor on election night. He was ahead by 72 votes. But after a correction had been made in the count in one county, Republican challenger Richard McIntyre pulled ahead by 34 votes.

Indiana's secretary of state certified Mr. McIntyre as the winner, but the Democrats demanded a full recount in each of the district's 15 counties. That recount had not been completed by the first week in January, and both men showed up to be sworn in when the House met. Because the earlier count had been so close and the recount was still in progress, the House, on a party-line vote, refused to seat either man that day, though both have been on the payroll temporarily. The postponement was reasonable at that time.

Last week a recount of all counties in the 8th District was completed, and the final figures show Mr. McIntyre to be the winner by a comfortable 418 votes. There are no allegations of fraud, and even though thousands of ballots were disqualified during the recount, the action was taken, in 90 percent of the cases by election commissions dominated by Democrats. Nevertheless, the House on Thursday refused once again to seat Mr. McIntyre—even conditionally—because the Committee on House Administration is reviewing the returns. This process is expected to take another 45 days.

Mr. McCloskey has every right to challenge the result of the election in court, as former Rep. George Hansen has done in his tight Idaho contest. But there is no need for the House to wait for a judicial determination to seat the winner. Nor is it necessary to leave the people of Indiana's 8th District without a voting representative in Congress until April. The votes are in. They have been counted twice. The margin of victory is comfortable, and Indiana election officials have twice certified the winner. The House is the final judge of the qualifications of its members, but until and unless the Committee on Administration finds otherwise, Mr. McIntyre ought to be seated.

That is the Washington Post calling for the seating of Congressman McIntyre.

Let me make this case again to reinforce the Post's point. The burden of proof is on the Democrats who lost the election, not on Mr. McIntyre who won the election. The secretary of

state said on election night that Mr. McIntyre won. The secretary of state has said now that the recount is done, Mr. McIntyre has won. Therefore, the burden of proof is on those who would take away his seat, not on him. He should be seated until there is proof conclusive that he should not have won. Every indication at the present moment is that he is seated, that he has won, that the people voted for him. And yet what do we find? We find that the people of the Eighth District of Indiana have no representation.

Other people around America are beginning to notice this case. The Winkler County News from the small town of Kermit, TX, wrote this editorial entitled "Poor Losers," and it is interesting that it was a Texan who was the Democratic leader who moved to take the seat away from the people of Indiana, and here is a Texas newspaper commenting in an editorial entitled "Poor Losers."

Residents of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District are being denied representation in Washington in a blatant abuse of power by Democrats controlling the House of Representatives. Richard D. McIntyre was elected to the House from the Eighth District last November, but he still is on the outside looking in. The election was a close one. Mr. McIntyre was certified the winner over the Democrat Frank McCloskey by a scant 34 votes in December. Mr. McCloskey demanded a recount, which was not expected. Now the recount has been completed by county election commissions that were dominated by Democrats in 11 of the 15 counties comprising the Eighth District. Mr. McIntyre again emerged the winner, but by the more substantial margin of 415 votes. The Democrats are turning out to be poor losers. Representative Tony Coelho of California, chairman of the party's Congressional Campaign Committee, insists the returns still are not conclusive. He points out that 1,000 ballots were ruled invalid in the precinct with a heavy pro-McCloskey vote, but conveniently ignores the fact that thousands more were ruled invalid in precincts that favored Mr. McIntyre. Election officials in Indiana are satisfied that the election of Mr. McIntyre was on the up and up, but the Democratic leadership in the House is insisting that the seat remain open until the House Administration Committee, which it controls, has had a chance to investigate the case. The investigation, of course, is a last ditch effort to find some reason to give the seat to Mr. McCloskey. This is believed to be the first time the House of Representatives has ever refused to seat a person whose election was duly certified by State election authorities. If the Democratic majority is allowed to impose its will in this manner, the implications are frightening. Why bother to have elections if the party controlling Congress can overrule the results? If McIntyre is not seated promptly, voters in Indiana should seek an order from a Federal Court granting them the representation in Congress that is being duly denied to them by the losing side in the November election."

Now, let me point out two things from this editorial from the Winkler County News in Kermit, TX. First of

all, they make very clear that in 11 of the 15 counties that did the recount, Democrats provided the majority of the counters, so it was not a Republican steal of a seat. In 11 out of the 15 counties it was local Democrats in Indiana trying to hold an honest election and those local Democrats reported that Mr. McIntyre won.

Second, if we were truly going to be bipartisan, we would have a task force on the election similar to the way we run the Ethics Committee. On the Ethics Committee there are as many Republicans as there are Democrats. There are an equal number. They can only make a decision by ensuring that both parties agree; however, the election task force has two Democrats and only one Republican.

The fact is that if we truly were interested only in a bipartisan way of counting the ballots, we would have a task force that had the same number of Democrats as Republicans and that sought to make truly bipartisan decisions.

Now, I think there is a great deal of wisdom in the Winkler County News assertion:

Election officials in Indiana are satisfied that the election of Mr. McIntyre was on the up and up, but the Democratic leadership in the House is insisting that the seat remain open until the House Administration Committee, which it controls, has had a chance to investigate the case. The investigation, of course, is a last ditch effort to find some reason to give the seat to Mr. McCloskey.

It should worry every Member of this body that papers from the Washington Post to a Texas weekly are beginning to suggest that this body would take a seat away from the people of Indiana, would give that seat to a man who lost the election, because that indeed strikes at the very heart of the electoral process.

□ 1500

Major cities have also looked at this case. The Detroit Free Press, on February 14, 1985. Detroit, again, is not Texas, it is not Washington; a third voice from the Nation at large.

On February 14, the Detroit Free Press, in an editorial entitled, "Democracy in America," says as follows:

On today's op-ed page, Rep. Guy Vander Jagt gives a fairly detailed chronology of an outrage taking place in the U.S. House of Representatives. The Democratic leadership of the House had decided not to seat Richard McIntyre who, in the judgment of Indiana's secretary of state, won the right to represent Indiana's 8th District in Congress. House Speaker Tip O'Neill, Majority Leader Jim Wright, and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Tony Coelho defend their action by saying the election was improperly conducted, that Republicans threw out lots of votes—particularly in black precincts favorable to Mr. McIntyre's opponent, Frank McCloskey—and that the voters deserve a fresh, new election.

None of these pious justifications make much sense. No one has questioned the honesty of the election and nearly 90 percent of the ballots thrown out were discarded by Democratic election officials. What Democrats really want is to increase their sizable majority—they control more than 58 percent of the House seats, even though they won only 50.03 percent of the votes for those seats—by stealing a close election.

A couple of interesting things have happened since Rep. Vander Jagt wrote his piece, however. First, five Democrats refused to endorse their leadership's decision to ignore democratic tradition. In a vote to kill a Republican-sponsored "privileged motion" that would have seated Mr. McIntyre, Romano Mazzoli and four colleagues thumbed their noses at their party leaders.

Second, Mr. McIntyre and Everett Robertson, Jr.—an 8th District voter—have filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, charging that House officials violated their First Amendment rights to free speech and Fifth Amendment rights to due process under the law by refusing to seat Richard McIntyre, give him an office, perform support services, and repay his travel expenses to and from his district. The suit asks the court to seat the Republican, force House Speaker O'Neill to administer the oath of office to the Republican, and demand that House officers give him an office, perform typical duties for the congressman, and grant him admission to House chambers. Democrats have asked to have the suit dismissed.

In a perfect world, the court would agree. The House's imperious action has no precedent in American history. Of the 82 challenged seatings of members-elect since 1933, 81 favored the winner. The only exception was the Rousch vs. Chambers case in 1961, in which Indiana's Republican secretary of state certified two winners but de-certified the Republican incumbent, George Chambers, for alleged vote fraud.

The fraud in the McIntyre case illustrates the danger Alexis de Tocqueville described in *Democracy in America*—that "the unbounded power of the majority . . . is favorable to the legal despotism of the legislature." Such tyranny, he warned, can weaken people's respect for their leaders and for the rule of law.

Certainly, it's made lots of people question the integrity of the House leadership, which abandoned a tradition that Congress has honored for nearly two centuries when it refused to seat a certified winner of an election. Boss O'Neill and his henchmen have made a mockery of the democratic process and have sullied the Democratic Party in the process. They deserve whatever grief angry voters and politicians give them for denying Richard McIntyre his rightful place in the 99th Congress.

Now, the Detroit Free Press is asserting three things that every Democrat should consider before voting again, on seating McIntyre.

They are setting first, that the Democratic leadership—"What Democrats really want is to increase their sizable majority . . . by stealing a close election."

I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Democratic Members of this House have no intention of stealing an election. However, I am also convinced that they have gone

along with a process which the Detroit Free Press says, "The House's imperious action has no precedent in American history."

So in an unprecedented way, Democrats in this House have been going along with a process which is wrong, which is unconstitutional, and which again quoting de Tocqueville, "the unbounded power of the majority is favorable to the legal despotism of the legislature."

And they call it tyranny. And they warn, de Tocqueville warns, "Such tyranny can weaken people's respect for their leaders and for the rule of law."

And then the Detroit paper goes on to say:

Certainly it's made lots of people question the integrity of the House leadership, which abandoned a tradition that Congress has honored for nearly two centuries when it refused to seat a certified winner of an election.

Now, my plea to every Democrat who is not totally bound to the leadership, who is not frightened by the whip, who is not unwilling to challenge the Democratic Campaign Committee, is to look at this case before we vote again.

There are no constitutional grounds; there are no precedents, there are no legal grounds for refusing to seat Rick McIntyre while waiting for the task force to report. There is every precedent for seating Rick McIntyre, who won the election. There is every precedent for seating Rick McIntyre who has been certified by the State of Indiana.

Only the tyranny of the majority would prevent his seating, and let me say to my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle: If you seek to run this House by tyranny, then you give those of us in the minority no alternative except to oppose tyrants.

Clearly, in the McIntyre case, we have begun an extraordinarily dangerous precedent which, if continued, would have the gravest, the gravest dangers for this country. Because it establishes the precedent that some time in the next few centuries of America's history anyone with 218 votes could simply expel and then argue about anyone they did not want to be seated. By refusing to seat them, could then create, based on the precedent of 1985.

The ground rule that says "After all, we're not sure, why don't we have a task force, and let's not seat them while we're looking?" It is a far more serious constitutional challenge than the vast majority of Democrats have yet come to consider because they have two good reasons for not thinking about it.

First of all, if they really think about it, they might decide that McIntyre is right; that the people of Indiana deserve representation. And then, they might have to vote against their leadership.

Second, it is just so much easier to hide from the issue, to ignore the facts, to wander in and vote and hope no one notices.

This House had a chance Thursday a week ago to seat the man who won the election, to do what the constitutional precedents would suggest, to give the people of Indiana in the Eighth District a voice in Congress. This House failed.

It runs a very real risk now of being a body which is an affront to the Constitution and which is violating the very basic American principle of no taxation without representation. Because in fact, the people of Eighth District of Indiana have no representation at the present time because of the Democratic leadership's decision.

What do the people of Indiana think? Let me cite first the leading paper in the State, the Indiana Star, dated February 13, 1985. An editorial entitled, "Suing for a Seat."

This is from Indiana now, from the State capital.

And what does the Indiana Star say?

There is yet another twist in the tangled tale of Indiana's 8th Congressional District election. Republican Richard McIntyre, twice declared the winner and twice rebuffed by a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives, has now taken his case to a Washington, D.C. federal court.

McIntyre this week filed suit against Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill and the 221 Democrats who voted to keep the Eighth District seat vacant pending a House investigation of the election. He is asking that he be permitted to take office until the House rules on its own findings.

Indiana Secretary of State Edwin J. Simcox had certified that McIntyre had defeated Democrat incumbent Frank McCloskey by 34 votes and a later districtwide recount gave McIntyre a 418-vote edge.

On the opening day of Congress, Rep. Lee Hamilton, D-Ind., arguing that the certification was invalid and the election still unsettled, urged that McIntyre not be seated. It would be a disservice to the 500,000 residents of the 8th District "to seat the wrong man today only to have him unseated tomorrow," Hamilton said.

McIntyre's suit contends it is a much greater disservice to deny representation to the 500,000 residents of the 8th District, thereby violating their constitutional guarantees of free speech and association.

The House has the prerogative of judging the qualifications of its own members. That authority derives from the Constitution and ought not be questioned. In several respects, therefore, McIntyre's recourse to the judiciary is regrettable.

Yet McIntyre is miffed, and justifiably so, at the House's partisanship. Minutes after the House voted on Jan. 3 to deny Republican McIntyre his seat, it voted to seat another certified winner, Democrat Richard Stallings of Idaho, whose election is being contested by Republican George Hansen. In 82 other elections contested through the years, the House has allowed the certified winner to serve while disputes were settled. So McIntyre's case is unprecedented.

The best outcome would be for the House to recognize that it has made an unfortunate exception in McIntyre's case and permit him to be seated conditionally. If

that were done quickly, the suit would be moot and the court would not have to determine if it has jurisdiction.

An in-House settlement would be eminently preferable to a possible testy confrontation between two branches of government.

□ 1510

In other words, the Indianapolis Star is saying to the Members of this House, "You have made a mistake, reverse your decision now before the court rules and seat McIntyre until the task force reports."

Let me draw the distinction which the Indianapolis Star refers to. On the date that the Democratic leadership refused to seat McIntyre in a close election, Republicans in this House unanimously voted to seat a Democrat from Idaho in a very close election. We said he was certified even though there might be a contest, even though there is a lawsuit, even though the incumbent Republican, who was defeated in contesting it, he should be seated because the Democrat had the certification from Idaho.

There is no moral or legal ground to stop McIntyre from being seated if in fact the Democrat from Idaho is being seated. Yet the very Democrats who voted to seat the Idaho Democrat voted not to seat the Indiana Republican. It is clearly an act of discrimination. It is an act which has no precedent and it involves, I think, a very, very dangerous step against the Constitution.

Let me suggest also that we look at the Eighth District. Let us look first in the Evansville Press at a letter, an open letter, written to Mr. McCloskey, the defeated Democrat, by Dale McConaughay in the Evansville Press, Evansville, IN, in the Eighth Congressional District.

Mr. McConaughay says as follows. This is an open letter.

DEAR MR. MCCLOSKEY: You have waged a long, valiant and what for you as well as your opponent has to be a frustrating campaign.

That frustration is shared by 8th District constituents who, more than three months after the election, remain without a congressman. Many of those constituents have called this office, or written letters, expressing that frustration. You have no doubt heard from many others.

Some of them say they will never vote again. Fortunately, they appear to be in the minority. Most others have simply become cynical. But that cynicism, left unchecked, represents a cancer to the body politic, to our very democratic tradition.

That tradition, that system, is one that we cherish and respect because it has never failed in exalting individual valor, statesmanship and sacrifice for the common good, especially in the most trying of times where systems themselves seem to fail us.

The time has arrived to again summon those qualities.

What has become evident is that the proper course of action in the current dispute, one representing the best interests of 8th District constituents, cannot be inspired

by the system unless it is instigated by the individual.

If you persist in asking your Democratic colleagues who control the U.S. House of Representatives to essentially ignore the 8th District vote, to ignore the certificate of victory awarded your opponent, and to vote among themselves whom to seat, then you may have held onto a seat, but paid a terrible price to do so.

Your own colleagues' apparent reluctance to engage in so brazen, public and raw an act of power politics last Thursday, when five House Democrats defected from the party line and voted their conscience to seat your opponent.

Added evidence of reluctance by your colleagues can be found in the delays. House officials say it could be May—an added three months—before a congressman is seated from this district. As one who has served in that seat and understands the constitutional significance of taxpayer representation, you must find that unacceptable.

No one suggests you abandon your convictions or your proud fight; rather, that you step aside for now until the House completes its investigation, permitting conditional representation from this district by an opponent who at the moment holds the more valid claim to the seat.

What is gained by denying 500,000 residents of the 8th District a voice in Congress over the next three months?

Do you strengthen your claim to be a man who has the best interests of the people of your district at heart?

Do you show yourself to be a fair man who plays by the rules, even where those rules may appear less than favorable to your cause?

Do you enhance your reputation as a public servant?

Or, do you invite the incisive remarks from people like Rep. Bill Frenzel, the ranking Republican on the House Administration Committee, who charged last Thursday that: "The only way McCloskey can win is if he confuses his cronies so that they violate the law of the United States and the State of Indiana and vote him into Congress."

Much has been said in the long period since the November 6 election about "good faith."

Voters cast ballots in good faith on November 6. However, technically flawed ballots may have been, it seems a terrible miscarriage of justice to have tossed out thousands of them district-wide lacking conclusive evidence of any fraud.

The various local bipartisan commissions conducting recounts of ballots did so in good faith, though again flawed by inconsistent procedures from one county to the next which neither you nor your opponent protested sufficiently at that time.

The results soon after the election saw your opponent certified the winner by fewer than 50 votes. A Republican secretary of state who delayed certifying a winner can be criticized only for not having delayed that certification long enough, until the full recount was complete. But when that recount was complete, the margin of victory for your opponent grew to more than 400 votes.

"Good faith" on your own part should require respecting House tradition and permitting an opponent holding a victory certificate to be seated conditionally until you have satisfied the burden of proof that he doesn't have the right to his seat.

Since this is the kind of individual valor, statesmanship and sacrifice for the common good which is so desperately needed just

now to regain some measure of voter trust and confidence.

In other words, a local editorial writer in the Eighth District of Indiana who has personally watched every day the process unfold comes to the conclusion that Mr. McIntyre won the election, that he won the recount and that, in fact, the time has come to change things. The time has come for this House to seat the winner, to give representation to the people of the Eighth District of Indiana.

Consider the editorial again from Evansville from the Evansville Press entitled "Time To Take A Seat." Notice this pattern. In Texas, a local writer says, looking at this process, the House is cheating. It is unfair. The Democratic leadership is doing something unprecedented.

In the Washington Post, they say the time has come to seat Mr. McIntyre.

In Detroit, they say the time has come to seat Mr. McIntyre.

In the State Capitol of Indiana, they say the time has come to seat Mr. McIntyre.

By a personal individual editorial writer in the Eighth District of Indiana, the time has come to seat Mr. McIntyre.

And now from the Evansville Press an editorial entitled "Time To Take A Seat."

I quote:

TIME TO TAKE A SEAT

The time has come for the United States House of Representatives to lay politics aside and consider the people of the 8th Congressional District of Indiana.

In its most recent action, the House once again refused to seat either Richard McIntyre or Frank McCloskey as the winner of last November's election. Instead, the House is conducting its own investigation of the close race and will report its findings by late April. As a result, it is likely the 8th District will be without representation until May, or beyond.

This is reprehensible and unacceptable.

That the House has the right to—and should—investigate the close election is not the question here. What is questionable is why the House does not seat the apparent winner until information to the contrary comes to light.

Mr. McIntyre, the Republican, was certified the original winner by a very slender margin, fewer than 50 votes; now, after a recount, he has again been declared a winner, by a more substantial 418 votes.

Mr. McCloskey, the Democrat, argues that the recounts were conducted under haphazard and inconsistent rules, and with that this newspaper agrees. But no where is anyone alleging fraud, and most of the commissions that participated in the recounts were dominated by Democrats. The fact that the recounts were inconsistent should not hinder the seating of Mr. McIntyre until the Democrat controlled House proves that recount certified the wrong man, or until a more consistent recount is ordered by the House Administration Committee, which now is handling the matter.

The argument that neither candidate should be seated until that committee

reaches a decision ignores the fact that there are two other disputed elections now before the committee, and in both cases, the certified winner has been seated pending a resolution.

No one argues with Mr. McCloskey's right to challenge the result of the election. But Mr. McIntyre should be seated—conditionally—while that challenge is being resolved so the people of the 8th District of Indiana at least have someone in Congress to handle their affairs.

The votes are in. They have been counted twice. Mr. McIntyre has won both times. A serious responsibility now rests with the House. It must determine either that the recount was in error and another recount is justified, or it must seat Mr. McIntyre. In either event, it must follow its own tradition and seat the certified winner, Mr. McIntyre, in the interim.

By refusing to do so would only prove many people's worse suspicions: that the U.S. House of Representatives is more interested in playing politics than serving the people it has been entrusted to represent.

All voters in all districts, should remember that the next time the polls open.

□ 1520

Now, that is an editorial from the Evansville Press, in the Eighth District, saying that it is time to seat the winner of the election and making the point that in other contested elections we seat the man or woman who is certified as the winner while we look at the election.

If this was just a partisan matter, if this was just fun and games at party politics level, frankly, as a Republican, it might be tempting to let the seat go vacant until May, because, as the news media around the country begins to focus, as I have quoted already from Indiana, from Detroit, MI, from Texas, and from Washington, DC, as the news media begin to focus on the Democratic Party in this House, the vision of the Democratic leadership stealing the seat is so disturbing that it is helpful to Republicans to drag this out, to have several months of reminding the country that the Democratic leadership is willing to deny representation of the taxpayers of the Eighth District, to violate the basic American principles of fair play, and to break the constitutional precedent.

In fact, there is one article which should chill every Democrat in this House, in terms of the longrun implications of this current procedure.

On January 28, 1985, in the Detroit News, in an editorial under "Our Opinions," entitled, "The Undemocratic Party," the following was written:

The Democratic Party, ostensibly the party of compassion and fairness, had decided that Republican votes don't count in Indiana's 8th Congressional District. Indiana's secretary of state has certified Richard McIntyre as the victor in his race against previous incumbent Democrat Frank McCloskey, and a recount this week widened his ostensible margin of victory from 34 votes to 415 votes.

But House Speaker Tip O'Neill and Tony Coelho, chairman of the Democratic Con-

gressional Campaign Committee, have declared the voters and the Indiana officials wrong. Nothing has changed the fact that Frank McCloskey won on Election Day, and an honest, complete, and nonpartisan vote count will confirm that, Rep. Coelho said recently. So the Washington pols have voted themselves the power to overturn the judgment of the people of Indiana.

Here's what happened. Republicans learned on election eve that the returns from two precincts had been counted twice, giving Mr. McCloskey an apparent victory. They asked the local county clerk to notify the secretary of state that the results from that county were in error, but the clerk, a Democrat, refused. Republicans took the matter to court, where a Democratic judge eventually ordered the clerk to amend the results. When that was done, Mr. McIntyre was certified the winner by the secretary of state (a Republican), and the results were forwarded to the clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Under normal procedures, that would have been the end of the matter. No one had alleged fraud in the election, and no one implied that Mr. McIntyre had done anything shady or undignified. Democrats didn't even bother to challenge the results under the Contested Elections Act, which sets forth a procedure for reviewing very tight elections. The law in effect lets the House review an election much as a court would—taking depositions, reviewing evidence, even demanding a new election. At first, they tried to have the recount thrown out, asking a federal court to find fault with Indiana's recount procedure. The judge dismissed the case.

Meanwhile, a series of recounts was taking place in Indiana. County clerks appointed three-member, bipartisan election review boards, which examined ballots and double-checked procedures. Those recounts enlarged Mr. McIntyre's margin by 381 votes.

Still, Reps. O'Neill and Coelho wouldn't rest. They strong-armed colleagues into accepting House Resolution 1—the first legislation of the session—that essentially gave the House Administration Committee, and not the people of Indiana, final say about the election. The Democratic leaders argued that a 1961 case, in which Democrat Ed Rousch was seated after earlier results had given Republican George Chambers the victory, offers a precedent. But in that case, the Indiana secretary of state invalidated his own certification of victory for Mr. Chambers, after verifying charges of election fraud. As we noted above, there were no such charges or changes in certification this time around.

House leaders have merely confirmed that they believe in the one-man, one-vote concept only if it favors Democrats. Consider a few interesting statistics: Democrats won 50.03 percent of the popular vote for House seats this year, but district lines drawn by state legislatures gave them 58.16 of the seats in the House. By the same token, the membership on key committees hardly reflects Americans' preferences on policy. Democrats hold 58.7 percent of the votes on the Budget and Armed Services committees and 61.4 percent of the seats on the Appropriations Committee.

The McIntyre case demonstrates with frightening clarity how politicians can abandon their principles for partisan reasons. In a fairer world, the House would seat Richard McIntyre provisionally, and let the courts or the sovereign people of Indiana do what they must to resolve matters further.

He has, by any reasonable standard, won that seat fairly. His only sin seems to be that he didn't win by enough votes to make Tip O'Neill happy.

Let me carry you back, for a moment, to what newspaper after newspaper has said about our current situation.

Very strong words have been used. From the Detroit News, the words, "frightening clarity, how politicians can abandon their principles for partisan reasons."

From the Indianapolis Star, "McIntyre case is unprecedented."

From the Evansville newspaper we are warned by Mr. McConaughay of cynicism, a cancer to the body politic, to our very democratic tradition.

From the Evansville newspaper's own editorial, they say it is "reprehensible and unacceptable." They charge that the House of Representatives is "playing politics."

From the Detroit Free press, they cite de Tocqueville's warning of the legal despotism of the legislature of tyranny.

Every person who voted to seat McIntyre, the five Democrats who had the courage to rebel against their party's whip, the 180 or so Republicans, now face a real choice. By any reasonable standard, as measured in Michigan, in Texas, in the Washington Post, in Indiana itself, this House is now violating the constitutional precedent. Every time we walk in this body and we permit tyranny and we permit a majority to steal a seat from the people of Indiana, every time we vote without the people of Indiana's Eighth District having a vote, we tolerate tyranny.

It is precisely this kind of erosion, this kind of arrogance of power, which most worried the Founding Fathers. They were very aware, in the Wilkes case in Britain, just before the American Revolution, of the dangers that a legislative body would decide not to seat someone chosen by the people. The Founding Fathers knew well the political bosses, ideological factions, interest groups could make decisions which deny to the people their voice, their spokesman, their seat. The Founding Fathers would never have tolerated this kind of scene. So we face a real challenge. And I urge every Democrat who voted not to give the people of Indiana a voice to look again at this case.

What you have been told by your leadership is simply not correct. It is not true to assert that the Democratic incumbent ever had a majority. It is simply not true. The only time he appeared to have a majority was a mathematical error because one clerk counted two precincts twice. There has never been an accurate or honest count which in any way gave the Democratic incumbent the majority. He lost the election. He lost the recount by a bigger margin.

It is simply not true to suggest that Indiana's law is peculiarly vague or strange. The fact is the State of Indiana has adopted very strict rules precisely to prevent cheating, to prevent stuffing the ballot box, to prevent voting by people who might put in a number of ballots without having the number of people.

□ 1530

The reason they have to initial each ballot is to make sure that a real person voted, and to turn that law on its head and suggest that those votes were thrown out in order to cheat is a disgrace. It is to shame the people of Indiana. It is to suggest that the State of Indiana would steal a seat. It is to suggest that the secretary of state and the legislature would conspire. In effect the honor of the State of Indiana is being smeared by those who suggest that a duly sent certificate should not be counted.

It is simply wrong to cite the 1961 case. It is factually inaccurate. There has never been a certificated winner in modern times who was not seated if his certificate was valid. The 1961 case is a red herring thrown across the path to stop the argument. Some members of the Democratic leadership have systematically and deliberately confused the issue and have sought to avoid an honest and fair hearing.

The fact is that McIntyre has won the election and McIntyre has won the recount. The people of Indiana's Eighth District deserve a hearing, and the challenge to those of us who believe that is to now ask, "What should we do when faced with a legislative tyranny which is willing to stop the people of Indiana from having their representation?"

I deeply urge every Member to look at this case. If you already believe that McIntyre should be seated, ask yourself, "What are the moral burdens and obligations you carry to insure in the next few days that McIntyre is seated and that the people of Indiana have their true voice?"

On the other hand, if you have not yet been convinced, look at the case. Read the Washington Post editorial, read the Indianapolis editorial, read the Evansville, IN, editorial, read the Detroit editorials, read the Texas editorials. Why is it, if your leadership's case makes any sense, that again and again around the country, when people look at this case, they say, "You ought to seat McIntyre"? If the Democrats' case is so powerful, why did it fail to convince the Washington Post?

The fact is that there are no good, decent, legal grounds to avoid seating McIntyre.

Finally, every citizen who studies this case should ask himself, "What should I do? How did my Member

vote? Does my local news media understand this issue?" Because I think it really was said exactly correctly in the Evansville Press in the Eighth District, in the editorial entitled, "Time To Take a Seat," when they said at the very end: "All voters in all districts should remember that the next time the polls open."

The fact is that if this House has the power to steal a seat from the people of Indiana, it has the power to steal a seat from the people of Texas; it has the power to steal a seat from the people of Georgia; it has the power to steal a seat from the people of California; and it has the power to steal a seat from the people of New York.

If this year they can deny Rick McIntyre and the people of the Eighth District a seat, then what can they do the next time? If we sit by passively and allow a handful of men to impose their will, to seize a seat, then what will they try next time? And what, 20 or 30 or 40 years from now, will their successors try?

We have here a clear case. The time to reassess the precedent that a certified winner sits in this House until the election committee reports is now. The time to draw the line and say the people of the United States deserve representation, full representation, for 2 full years is now.

I hope that every Member of this House will look carefully at this case, for in the next few days you will have a chance to vote again, and I hope this time you will vote, not as the Democratic whip insists, not as the Democratic Campaign Committee asks, but you will look at the real facts of the case and you will decide to vote to seat the person whom the people of Indiana elected, the secretary of state of Indiana certified, and the recount indicated won, and then allow the task force to do its work.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only reasonable and honorable procedure.

A STUDENT SPEAKS OUT ON CUTS IN THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a touching letter from one of my constituents who is a high school senior considering her plans for college. She is afraid that if the Congress adopts the President's proposed cuts in the Student Loan Program and other student assistance programs, she will not be able to afford to attend a college that has her desired field of study. The full text of her letter is as follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SEIBERLING: I have just finished reading an article about President Reagan's plans for the Guaranteed Student Loan and financial aid.

I am, at the moment, extremely confused. Being a senior at Stow High School, I have done much thinking about college and my plans and goals. Because I am paying for my college expenses by myself, I am greatly in need of any aid I can receive. It is possible for me to attend a nearby university with an academic scholarship I have received; however, this university does not have my desired major in their curriculum. I am in need of assistance to attend Ohio State University.

As a current high school student, I have faced many changes because of the stressed "Excellence in Schools." President Reagan seems very concerned about high school students and their college board examinations, but may I ask what benefits a high SAT or ACT score has if one cannot afford to attend a quality university to which he has been accepted because of these scores? It seems to me that someone who is interested in bettering students would also want these people to attend a university to further this education. It has been expressed many times by various people that the future of this country is dependent on the people in my age group. Where is the country going if we cannot get more than a high school diploma?

This issue is extremely important to me and many other affected students. I hope we will receive your support.

Sincerely,

LAURA A. CASTNER.

I think that this letter clearly states why the Federal Government should have a responsibility to provide some financial assistance to students and to educational institutions. In order to provide equal opportunity for advancement in our society, the Federal Government should provide assistance to those who could not afford an education without the Government's help.

As we make difficult budget choices in the coming months, I urge my colleagues to consider how our decisions affect the lives of our constituents like this high school senior.●

PRODUCTIVITY INCENTIVE ACT

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to encourage better labor-management relations and greater productivity in the United States.

The domestic manufacturing sector of the economy has been under severe pressure from foreign competition over the past decade. While foreign competitors have frequently had advantages in terms of newer production facilities and lower labor costs, I'm convinced that one of the most important factors in the import revolution has been the productivity gains made by our foreign trading partners.

Under the prevailing wage system in this country, employees often feel that they have little stake in the company's performance. Wages usually bear no direct relationship to company earnings, and companies usually adjust to

downturns in the business cycle simply by laying their employees off. As a result, workers perceive their pay increases as being wholly independent of the company's profitability, and no clear link is established between pay and productivity. The hourly wage system gives employees little incentive to use their experience and ingenuity to help their company become more profitable by cutting costs and increasing productivity. The result has meant all-too-often that American manufacturers cannot compete with the productivity gains made by their foreign competition. Profits decline as imports penetrate the American market. Jobs are lost.

The prevailing wage structure also emphasizes the divergence rather than the community of interest between employer and employee and thereby contributes greatly to the antagonism that has been so characteristic of labor-management relations in the United States. We cannot afford such antagonism if we are to remain competitive in the changing global economy.

There are signs that workers and management are beginning to understand better the need to emphasize community of interest in the labor field. A Washington Post article of February 17 detailed the efforts by the U.S. auto industry to rethink its wage structure. General Motors, which committed recently to produce the Saturn, a completely new car for the American market, is examining ways of increasing worker involvement in quality and productivity improvement. The basic objective of the Saturn project is to improve productivity by nearly 50 percent, stripping some 60 of the 130 worker hours it now takes to build an average GM car. GM intends to achieve that goal by using its work force more effectively and, apparently, by drawing on the wealth of knowledge and experience of its employees to maximize productivity in the assembly line.

This is welcome news. Congress can and should help efforts to improve productivity by providing incentives to do so. My bill would encourage employers to adopt a wage base and a bonus determined by reference to company profits or cost savings, with the bonus comprising up to one-third of the employee's annual income. To offset any additional cost associated with establishing and running this new wage system, employers would receive a tax credit equal to 10 percent of the bonus in the first year of operation, 5 percent in the second year, and 3 percent in the third.

The bill would give workers a strong incentive to be more cost conscious and productivity conscious, since their pay would depend to a degree on the earnings of the company or increases

in productivity. To the extent that profit or gain sharing are adopted, the system would give the company a means of adjusting its labor costs during economic downturns without cutting the workers' base pay or, more important, without resorting to the traditional layoffs to maintain a specified level of corporate profitability. The resulting job security cannot help but produce greater loyalty on the part of employees, and an improvement in employer-employee relations. The bill should not be construed as a one-way street. It would be reasonable for employees, in exchange for their acceptance of a bonus wage plan, to be given more of a say in company operations, particularly those which tie directly to productivity, and hence to their bonus.

My bill is not a cure-all for our country's economic problems, but it should help improve job security as well as productivity, and many other changes are in order if we are going to reverse our poor productivity growth over the past few years. If we concentrate instead on dividing up a diminishing economic pie, we will all be losers. Our goal should be to enlarge the pie by examining policies and practices which hinder productivity, and replacing them with practices which encourage productivity gains and enhance job security.

A copy of the Washington Post article follows these remarks.

AUTO INDUSTRY SEEKS A NEW WAGE MODEL
(By Warren Brown)

When the U.S. auto industry introduced the assembly line early in the century, it revolutionized the way the American worker was paid. With a firm grip on the pace of production, U.S. manufacturing industries installed the hourly wage system—which has prevailed ever since.

Now the auto industry once again has become a laboratory for pay in America as manufacturers search for new ways to tie blue-collar wages to corporate performance.

General Motors Corp., for example, is examining the concept of "gain sharing," in which blue collar employees, working closely with management on the factory floor, are rewarded for their contributions to both quality and productivity.

These experiments may well change both the way millions of people are paid in this country and how a whole range of products outside the auto industry are manufactured.

But market forces unlike those of the early days of the industry are behind the new pressures for change. The assembly line permitted development of the mass production capabilities needed to meet vast, unmet consumer demand for an emerging product. And the hourly wage was a means to stabilize the industry work force.

Today, the search for a new pay system in America is the result of a much different challenge—shrinking domestic markets, largely caused by foreign competition. U.S. manufacturers are searching for new ways to compete in a post-industrial society.

The current focus for change is the new Saturn project announced recently by General Motors. GM Chairman Roger B. Smith said his company was going outside the cur-

rent corporate structure to create Saturn Corp., a completely new car company for the American market.

Saturn's basic objective is to produce up to 500,000 subcompact cars annually, beginning by 1990. Its overall goal is to change domestic auto production methods radically, to strip 60 worker-hours from the average 130 hours GM now uses to build one car, and to come up with a pay system that more closely reflects production costs and corporate performance.

Ford and Chrysler are working on similar projects with similar aims. Ford calls its program Alpha. Chrysler has Concept 90.

In announcing the Saturn project, Smith said GM was giving the new company a "clean sheet" to build its cars. This would include a new relationship with the United Auto Workers union and the way its members would be paid, he said.

Neither Saturn nor UAW officials have offered any details on what type of pay system might be devised at the new GM company. But besides "gain sharing," company officials are using such terms as "pay-for-knowledge" (also known as "versatility premium"), and "employee involvement" to describe the system they hope will emerge eventually.

The push for a new wage system for the U.S. auto business follows a decade of decimation and change for the industry's work force. Imports rose from 15.2 percent of overall U.S. auto sales in 1970 to 23.4 percent in 1984 (reaching an all-time high of 30.5 percent in the third quarter of 1982).

Since 1979, the auto industry work force has been cut more than 40 percent—a loss of 656,000 jobs.

The erosion of jobs and the wave of imports appear to have created a new setting for labor-management relations in the industry as employer and worker search for ways to meet competition. These efforts at cooperation are intensifying as the major Japanese auto companies begin to set up manufacturing operations on American soil using techniques and traditions from their home country.

But not all will be imitation on the part of the Americans. GM's Smith, for example, said the Saturn operation will be designed "to leapfrog the Japanese." And George Hoffer, an economist and auto industry analyst at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, predicted that the "Japanese mystique will disappear" as more Japanese auto makers are producing vehicles in this country.

By 1990, the Japanese will be able to make as many as 900,000 cars a year in the United States, according to Maryann N. Keller, a director and analyst at New York-based Vilas-Fischer Associates.

Japan's Honda Motor Co. Ltd. and Nissan Motor Co. Ltd. built a total of 234,111 vehicles in the United States last year. Both companies, which so far operate without a union, are planning to expand U.S. production facilities.

Toyota Motor Corp. and General Motors Corp. have formed a joint-venture company, New United Motor Manufacturing Inc. (NUMMI), to build up to 250,000 subcompact cars annually in Fremont, Calif. Production began last Dec. 4. Toyota also is allowed to build its own cars here under the joint-venture agreement.

Mazda Motor Corp. last December announced plans to invest \$450 million in a new auto assembly facility in Flat Rock, Mich., where it plans to build 240,000 small cars annually. Mitsubishi Motors Corp. also

is considering the possibility of assembling cars in this country.

The Japanese are coming here with new work rules, new production methods and a resolve to create a domestic work force that is willing to share the risk as well as the rewards of free enterprise. They are seeking a basic attitudinal change, one that would make employees more like entrepreneurs.

The Japanese objective is simple. At home, they enjoy an advantage in production costs over their American competitors estimated at more than \$1,500 a car. They want to retain as much of the advantage as possible in their assembly operations in the United States.

U.S. auto industry analysts say the Japanese are traveling a difficult road. This country's car business traditionally has been characterized by inflexible work rules, an imbedded hourly-wage mentality and executive compensation practices that seem to assume guaranteed returns on investments, analysts say.

It will be difficult for the Japanese to alter this culture. But all of the Big Three domestics—GM, Ford Motor Co. and Chrysler Corp.—are acting as if the Japanese will succeed.

"That is the reason behind Saturn," Hoffer said.

"The main reason for Saturn is to break away from old union contracts and to establish flexibility in the workplace. GM no longer wants to have people on one specific line doing one specific job. The traditional auto assembler clearly will have a less important role in the cost of production," Hoffer said.

That does not mean assembly workers will disappear. "Your can't make a car without them, but there will be fewer of them. Their wages, as a result, will not be that much of a problem in the overall scheme of things," Hoffer said.

For example, to get 500,000 cars a year, Saturn officials will hire 6,000 production workers—3,000 per shift on a two-shift workday. GM would have had to hire about 10,000 production workers to get a similar output in 1975 and about 8,000 people to get a comparable yield in 1980, according to some industry analysts.

By assigning workers multiple tasks—the completion and quality of which would be aided by high-technology tools—Saturn would further lower the cost of production wages, Hoffer said.

GM's assembly workers currently receive an average base wage of \$12.82 an hour, including cost-of-living allowances, according to UAW spokesman David Mitchell. GM would be able to increase those wages with relatively little pain by having a smaller work force that worked more efficiently.

NUMMI, which will negotiate with the UAW in the spring, is looking at a program comparable to gain sharing. NUMMI appropriately calls its program the "Suggestion Plan." Like gain sharing, the NUMMI plan would reward individual workers or worker teams based on their specific contributions to better product quality and efficiency.

"That kind of thing is very big at Toyota," said Tina Bunyard, a spokeswoman for the company. NUMMI currently has an average base wage rate of about \$11 an hour. But "attendance awards" and other bonuses could lift that rate up to GM's average \$12.82 hourly level, NUMMI officials said.

GM and Ford already have profit sharing, which means that workers share a part of those companies' annual earnings. GM's profit-sharing pool last year was \$282 mil-

lion—an average of \$515 for each of the company's 547,000 employees—out of earnings of \$4.5 billion.

"Since 1985, we've always asked for profit sharing from the companies," said the UAW's Mitchell. "The companies said 'no' until 1982, when they didn't have any profits to share."

A ranking Chrysler official said last week that the company would push for profit sharing in contract negotiations scheduled next October. Mitchell said the UAW "does not regard profit sharing as a substitute for wage increases. We believe in wage increases, cost-of-living allowances and profit sharing on top of wages."

Mitchell said "there are really no fundamental changes" in the way the union approaches worker compensation. But he added that the union is not inflexible. "The UAW has always bargained based on the realities at the given bargaining table," he said.

With the growth of domestic production of Japanese cars, both the UAW and U.S. auto makers are being forced to rethink those realities, according to Audrey Freedman, labor economist at the The Conference Board in New York.

Mazda is a case in point, Freedman said. The Japanese auto maker has invited the UAW to represent what are expected to be 3,500 workers at its planned assembly facility in Flat Rock, near Detroit. But she said that Mazda is likely to push programs such as pay-for-knowledge.

GM officials said that they already are conducting some pay-for-knowledge experiments.

Nissan officials in Tennessee said that their comparable pay plan, which they call the "versatility premium," is running at top gear.

"We see no reason to have four maintenance men doing four separate maintenance jobs, when one can do all four," said Wayne L. Wright, Nissan's vice president for human resources in Smyrna.

"The better they become" at doing many jobs, "the more they earn," said Wright, who added that Nissan's U.S. workers receive a base hourly wage "in line" with the \$12.82 paid at GM and Ford.

In terms of hourly wages, "Our competitors are well aware that they pay too much. We're guilty of that, too," Wright said. Average hourly wages at GM and Ford are \$3.60 above the \$9.22 average for all manufacturing workers in the United States, according to the latest (October 1984) final figures provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

But Wright said that Nissan is getting more for its money because most of its 2,300 employees are trained to do more than one job. "This works to the benefit of the employees, as well," he said. "It upgrades their skills, makes them transferable and, when one job goes down, they don't have to go home."

Increasing plant and worker efficiency, and designing compensation plans to better support those goals, probably is the best way to cut costs, Wright said.

Peter J. Pestillo, Ford's vice president for employee relations, agrees with that assessment.

"I think one of the ways to produce cars more efficiently, and therefore cheaper, is to use your work force more effectively," Pestillo said. "Workers know how to save effort and give you yield and the kind of quality you need. To the extent that you engage them in that, you get it."

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION RELATING TO THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-29)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, February 20, 1985.)

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR THE 99th CONGRESS

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the House, I am pleased to submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which were adopted at the organizational meeting on February 7, 1985. The rules were agreed to by a unanimous voice vote.

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR THE 99TH CONGRESS

RULE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House are the rules of the committee and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the committee is a part of the committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

RULE II—MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day for the full committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Tuesday of each month, and at such other times and in such places as the chairman may designate; however, a regular Tuesday meeting of the committee may be dispensed with by the chairman.

(b) The chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the chairman.

(c)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or each subcommit-

tee thereto shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however:* That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by the committee or each subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however:* That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

RULE III—RECORDS AND ROLL CALLS

There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the committee and of each subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each such roll call vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to each record vote by the committee to report any bill or resolution, the total number of votes cast for and the total number of votes cast against the reporting of such bill or such resolution shall be included in the committee report.

RULE IV—QUORUMS

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum of the committee for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business: *Provided,* That any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE V—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) The chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the chairman or the subcommittee chairman, whichever the case may be, shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date.

The clerk of the committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and shall limit his or her oral presentation to a summary of the statement.

(c) When any hearing is conducted by the committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of such hearing, to call such witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(d) All other members of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such member who is not a member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee.

(e) Committee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the chairman for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for questioning a witness by any one member can be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both full and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

RULE VI—OVERSIGHT

(a) In order to assist the House in:

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of (A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress or (B) conditions and circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule VIII shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b).

(b) Each subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated.

In addition, each such subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee.

(c) Each subcommittee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdictions.

RULE VII—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Broadcasting, either by radio or TV of all open committee hearings and meetings shall be permitted when, in the judgment of the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, such action is warranted. Photographs shall be permitted during hearings of the full committee and subcommittees as the chairman decides.

All coverage shall be subject to the following provisions:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobolights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference

shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE VIII—NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) There shall be five standing subcommittees as follows: Oversight and Investigations; Hospitals and Health Care; Education, Training and Employment; Compensation, Pension and Insurance; and Housing and Memorial Affairs. All proposed legislation and other matters related to the subcommittees listed under standing subcommittees named below shall be referred to such subcommittees, respectively:

Oversight and Investigations: Investigative authority over matters that are referred to the subcommittee by the chairman of the full committee for investigation and appropriate recommendations.

Hospitals and Health Care: Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

Education, Training and Employment: Education of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, and readjustment of servicemen to civilian life.

Compensation, Pension, and Insurance: Compensation, pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special, and life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

Housing and Memorial Affairs: Veterans' housing programs, and cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior, and burial benefits.

(b) The chairman and the ranking minority member shall serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittee.

RULE IX—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcom-

mittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(b) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the committee. It shall be the duty of the chairman of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(c) In any event, the report of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the subcommittee notice of the filing of that request.●

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS FOR THE 99TH CONGRESS

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I submit herewith for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, in accordance with clause 2(a) of House rule XI:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

A. RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION

Rule 1. Rules of the House.—The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of its Committees and Subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege in Committees and Subcommittees. Written rules adopted by the Committees, not inconsistent with the Rules of the House, shall be binding on each Subcommittee. Each Subcommittee of a Committee is a part of that Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of that Committee. Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made a part of the Rules of the Committee which are supplementary to the Rules of the House.

Rule 2. Time, Place of Meetings.—(a) While Congress is in session, regular business meetings of the Committee shall be held in the regularly assigned committee room, Longworth House Office Building, beginning at 9:45 a.m. on each Wednesday, except that whenever any regularly scheduled party caucus or conference conflicts with such meeting of the Committee, then the Committee shall meet at a later time or on Thursday or on such other day as may be mutually agreed upon by the Chair and the Ranking Minority Member. Such meeting shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair, or in the absence of the

Chair, by the ranking majority member of the Committee present.

(b) Special meetings shall be held at the call of the Chair or upon written request of Members of the Committee as provided in Rule XI, Clause 2, of the Rules of the House. When a regularly called party caucus or party conference is scheduled to be in session after 10 a.m. on any day, and the Chair is so advised not later than 12 noon on the preceding day, the regularly scheduled Committee meeting for that day shall be rescheduled at a later time or as provided in paragraph (a) of this rule.

(c) Each meeting of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees for the transaction of business, including the mark-up of legislation, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That no person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or mark-up session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

Rule 3. Agenda for Meetings.—The agenda for Committee meetings, setting out all items of business to be considered, shall be available and delivered to the office of each Member at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting: *Provided*, That this requirement may be waived by a majority vote, a quorum being present.

Rule 4. Adjournment of Meetings.—A motion to adjourn shall not be approved unless the Chair, in his discretion, recognizes a Member for the purpose of making such motion and the motion is approved by a majority of the Members present and voting.

Rule 5. Committee Procedure.—(a) The date, time, place and subject matter of all public hearings of the Committee or any of its Subcommittees shall be announced at least 1 week in advance of the commencement of such hearings. If the Committee, or any of its Subcommittees, determines that there is good cause to expedite the hearing, it shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any such announcement shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest.

(b) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the Committee or Subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing: *Provided further*, That two or more Members at a meeting held for the purpose of taking testimony may determine, by a majority vote,

(1) to close such hearing for the purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger national security

or tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person in violation of rule XI, 2(k) (5) of the Rules of the House; or

(2) to close the hearing as provided in rule XI 2(k)(5) of the House.

(c) No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee, or its Subcommittees unless the House, by majority vote, authorizes the Committee or its Subcommittees, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close such meetings to Members by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing meetings to the public.

(d) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or one of its Subcommittees shall file with the Committee, at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall limit his oral presentation at his appearance to a brief summary of his argument, unless this requirement is waived by the Committee.

(e) The right to interrogate witnesses before the Committee or any of its Subcommittees shall alternate between the Majority Members and the Minority Members. In recognizing Members to question witnesses, the Chair may take into consideration the ratio of Majority and Minority party Members present and may recognize two Majority party Members for each Minority party Member recognized. Each Member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each Member of the Committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(f) No bill, recommendation, or other matter reported by a Subcommittee shall be considered by the Committee until 2 calendar days have elapsed from the time of the action of the Subcommittee and such action has been reported by the Committee Clerk to all Members of the Committee and, in the case of a bill, a copy has been delivered to the office of all Members so requesting the same, together with a section-by-section explanation and, if a change in present law is involved, a section-by-section comparison with the present law: *Provided*, That this requirement may be waived by a two-thirds vote of a quorum of the Committee Members.

Rule 6. Quorum.—No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Members of the Committee is present, but for the purpose of transacting any other Committee business one-third of the Members shall constitute a quorum. Testimony and evidence may be received at any meeting at which there are present two or more Members of the Committee. A quorum, once established, shall be deemed present unless a Member objects to the transaction of business due to the lack of a quorum. When a call of the roll is required to ascertain the presence of a quorum, the offices of all Members shall be so notified and the Members shall have not less than 10 minutes to prove their attendance. The Chair shall have the discretion to waive this requirement when a quorum is actually present or whenever a quorum is secured and may direct the Clerk to note the names of all Members present within the 10 minute period.

Rule 7. Proxies.—A vote by any Member in the Committee or in any Subcommittee may be cast by proxy, but such proxy must be in writing. Each proxy shall designate the Member who is to execute the proxy au-

thorization, shall assert that the Member is absent on official business or otherwise unable to attend, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a Member may authorize a general proxy for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the Member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

Rule 8. Subpenas and Oaths.—(a) A subpoena may be issued by a Committee or Subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee and approved by the Chair of the Full Committee and signed by his or her designee.

(b) The Chair of the Committee, the Chair of any of its Subcommittees, or any Member designated by either, may administer oaths to any witness.

Rule 9. Journal, Rollcalls.—(a) The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. A copy of the journal shall be furnished the Ranking Minority Member through the Minority Counsel. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member. No demand for a rollcall shall be made or entertained except for the purpose of securing a record vote or in the apparent absence of a quorum.

(b) At the beginning of any meeting of the Committee, the Chair may announce to the Committee, in its discretion, that further proceedings will be postponed on any motions on which a recorded vote is ordered or on which the vote is objected to under Rule 6 until immediately preceding the conclusion of the meeting. In such instances, the Committee shall proceed with the consideration of the next regularly scheduled measures or matters until all such business is disposed of or until such time as the Chair announces that the question will be put on the matter deferred. The question on any motion so postponed shall be put by the Chair and shall be disposed of by the Committee, without further debate, as expeditiously as possible. If the Committee adjourns before the question is put and determined on such motion, then the first order of business at the next meeting shall be the disposition of such motion.

(c) The result of each rollcall vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available in the Committee office for inspection by the public. Such records shall constitute the official attendance records of the Committee.

Rule 10. Filing of Committee Reports.—(a) All Members of the Committee shall be given an opportunity to review each proposed Committee report for at least 2 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to filing.

(b) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by this Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after the copy of the Committee report in substantially final form is completed, excluding formal or technical changes, in which to file such views, in writ-

ing and signed by that Member or Members, with the Clerk of the Committee. In the event that substantial or significant changes are made in the Committee report, such Member shall have not more than one calendar day to review such changes and alter his or her views in responding thereto. All such views so filed by one or more Members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(c) The time requirements of paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule shall run concurrently and shall not operate to delay the filing of Committee reports.

Rule 11. Record of Committee Proceedings.—(a) Evidence, testimony, and information relevant to any measure or matter before the Committee will be received for inclusion in the record of proceedings as determined appropriate. A formal transcript need not be made in all instances and the Chair may exercise discretion as to content of the record. A complete record of all Committee action, which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded, shall be kept and retained in the permanent files of the Committee. All printing of proceedings or of other matter shall be subject to general principles promulgated by the Chair as well as by approval in each instance not only by the Chair of the appropriate Subcommittee but also by the Chair of the Committee.

(b) All transcripts of public meetings and hearings shall be available for review in the offices of the Committee. Unrevised and unedited hearing transcripts shall not be reproduced in any form without the written consent of the Chair or of the Member involved. Transcripts of other public meetings of the Committee and its Subcommittees shall not be reproduced in any form without the written consent of the Chair of the Committee or, as appropriate, of the Chair of the Subcommittee involved, in his or her discretion. Records and transcripts of public meetings of the Committee, conducted during any prior Congress, may be made available for review in the offices of the Committee, but such records and transcripts shall not be reproduced except as permitted by the House of Representatives.

(c) No records or transcripts of Committee meetings held in executive session shall be released unless the Committee directs otherwise. All classified documents, transcripts, or other materials shall be maintained in an appropriately secured location and shall not be released for review by any unauthorized person. Authorized persons must review such classified materials at an appropriate location in the Committee offices, but such material shall not be removed from the Committee offices for any reason without the written permission of the Chair and, as appropriate, of the Chair of the Subcommittee involved.

Rule 12. Broadcasting of Committee Hearings.—(a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which Committee hearings, or Committee meetings, which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the

measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its Committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photograph, or by any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the Committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearing or other meeting or the activities of Committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the Committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the Committee, or any member or bring the House, the Committee, or any Member into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of Committee hearings and meetings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause. No recording of Committee or Subcommittee proceedings shall be permitted except as authorized pursuant to these rules.

(e) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by any Committee of the House is open to the public, that Committee may permit, by majority vote of the Committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the Committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(f) The following rules shall apply to the Committee and its Subcommittees:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any Member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed on the Committee rostrum or in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing or meeting by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International News pictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, on the Committee rostrum or between the witness table and the Members of the Committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Rule 13. Committee Staffs.—(a) Pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 6 of the Rules of the House, the permanent staff of the Committee shall consist of not more than 30 staff members who shall be selected on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions as follows:

three shall be chosen by the Committee from nominations approved by a majority of the Members of the Minority party of the Committee;

one shall be chosen by the Committee from nominations submitted by the Chair of

each of the standing Subcommittees of the Committee;

one shall be chosen by the Committee from nominations submitted by the ranking Minority party Member of each standing Subcommittee of the Committee; and

the balance of any unfilled positions shall be chosen by the Committee from nominations approved by a majority of the Members of the Majority party Members of the Committee;

The staff members selected by the Majority party shall be assigned such legislative, oversight, and administrative duties and responsibilities as the Chair of the Committee may prescribe and shall assist Committee Members in connection with matters related to Committee business. Each staff member nominated by a Subcommittee Chair shall be under the general supervision and direction of that Subcommittee Chair. The staff members selected by the Minority party shall be under general supervision and direction of the Minority party Members of the Committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate.

(b) A Subcommittee Chair shall be entitled to select and designate additional staff members, subject to the approval of a majority of the Majority party Members of the Committee, to assist the Subcommittee in carrying out its legislative, investigative and oversight responsibilities. The Minority shall be accorded fair and equitable consideration with respect to the appointment of additional staff, but Minority staffing shall continue to be approximately one-third Minority representation on the Committee. Such staff members shall be assigned such duties pertaining to Subcommittee business as the Subcommittee Chair or the Minority, respectively, deem advisable and shall be compensated at a salary commensurate with the responsibilities prescribed by such Subcommittee Chair or by the Minority.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule, the Committee may employ such additional nonpartisan staff as it deems necessary to conduct the administrative and clerical functions of the Committee. Such staff shall be in addition to any staff designated exclusively for the Majority or Minority party and shall be appointed only with the approval of a majority of the Members of the Majority party and with the approval of a majority of the Members of the Minority party. The Chair of the Committee shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such members of the staff and they shall be compensated at a salary commensurate with the responsibilities prescribed.

(d) In the event that staff is not otherwise available pursuant to paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule, from the funds provided for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to any primary and additional expense resolution:

(1) The Chair of each standing Subcommittee is authorized to appoint at least one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the Subcommittee Chair.

(2) The ranking Minority party Member of each standing Subcommittee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking Minority party Member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (a) and (b) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the Subcommittee Chair pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 5(d) of the House of Representatives.

(4) The staff positions made available to the Subcommittee Chair and ranking Mi-

nority party Members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph shall be made available from the staff positions provided under Rule XI, Clause 6 unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(e) All staff selected pursuant to this rule shall be approved by the Committee and shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to the business of the Committee and its Subcommittees. The staff of a Subcommittee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair of that Subcommittee. The staff assigned to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Minority party Members of the Committee who may delegate such authority as they determine appropriate. The staff of the Committee not assigned to a Subcommittee or to the Minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair of the Committee, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as determined appropriate.

B. SUBCOMMITTEES: JURISDICTION, COMPOSITION, AND POWERS

Rule 14. Subcommittee Rules.—The Rules of the Committee, where applicable, shall be the Rules of its Subcommittees.

Rule 15. Reference of Legislation.—(a) Except for bills, resolutions, or matters involving Indians and Indian Tribes and the Commonwealths and Territories of the United States which shall be retained for consideration by the Committee unless referred by the Chair to an appropriate standing, select, or special Subcommittee, every bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the Committee shall be referred to subcommittee within 2 weeks from the date of its referral to the Committee unless the Chair, with the approval of a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee, orders that it be retained for consideration by the Committee or that it be referred to a select or special Subcommittee.

(b) A bill, resolution, or other matter referred by the Chair to a Subcommittee may be recalled therefrom by him or her with the approval of a majority of the Members of the Committee for the Committee's direct consideration or for referral to another Subcommittee. The Chair shall so inform the Members of this recommendation, in writing, and such recommendation shall be effective within 1 week if approved by a majority of the Members of the Committee.

(c) A bill, resolution, or other matter referred by the Committee to a Subcommittee may be recalled from such Subcommittee at any time by majority vote of a quorum of the Committee for its direct consideration or for reference to another Subcommittee.

Rule 16. Subcommittees.—There shall be the following six standing Subcommittees of the Committee: Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment; Subcommittee on Public Lands; Subcommittee on General Oversight, Northwest Power, and Forest Management; Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources; Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources; and Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. Additional standing Subcommittees may be created by resolution of the Committee.

Rule 17. Jurisdiction of Subcommittees.—(a) The jurisdiction, including legislative, investigative, and oversight responsibilities, of the six standing Subcommittees shall, sub-

ject to alteration as other Subcommittees are created, be as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

(a) Recommendations with respect to laws and programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee made by the Council on Environmental Quality in its annual Environmental Quality Report to the Congress.

(b) Selected matters and proposals, as referred by the Chairman, involving the environmental impacts of any laws or programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(c) Regulation of the domestic nuclear energy industry, including regulation of research and development of reactors and nuclear regulatory research and special oversight functions with respect to nonmilitary nuclear energy and research and development, including the disposal of nuclear waste.

(d) Petroleum conservation on the public and other Federal lands and conservation of the uranium supply in the United States.

(e) Legislation concerning the transportation of natural gas from or within Alaska or concerning the disposition of oil transported by the trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

(a) Public lands, generally, including measures or matters related to entry, easements, withdrawals, and grazing.

(b) Measures and matters relating to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act.

(c) Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.

(d) Forest reserves created from the public domain.

(e) National Wilderness Preservation System and all matters relating thereto.

(f) Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain and other Historic Preservation programs, including the Historic Preservation Fund.

(g) Cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance, and improve international programs for the conservation of land and related resources, particularly as they may affect conservation efforts on the public lands of the United States.

(h) All measures and matters involving the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and Antarctica.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL OVERSIGHT, NORTHWEST POWER, AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

(a) General and continuing oversight and investigative authority over activities, policies, and programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee as may be referred to the Subcommittee by the Chair of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Chair of the principal standing legislative Subcommittee involved.

(b) Such remedial legislation resulting from the findings or recommendations of the Subcommittee as may be referred to the Subcommittee, after consultation with the Chair of the principal standing legislative Subcommittee involved.

(c) Forest management of forest reserves created from the public domain, except matters in the jurisdiction of other subcommittees.

(d) Measures or matters pertaining to Northwest power and the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act, together with jurisdiction over all transmission lines referred thereto by the Chair of the Full Committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER RESOURCES

(a) Irrigation and reclamation projects and other water resources development programs, including policies and procedures relating thereto.

(b) Compacts relating to the use and apportionment of interstate waters.

(c) Water rights and water related programs of the Geological Survey.

(d) Saline water research and development program and water resources research program.

(e) Water resources planning conducted pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act.

(f) Programs involving major interbasin movement of water or power.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINING AND NATURAL RESOURCES

(a) Mining interests generally, including deep seabed mining and matters involving the Law of the Sea Treaty.

(b) Mineral resources of the public lands, except matters involving the Outer Continental Shelf.

(c) Mineral land laws, and claims and entries thereunder.

(d) Geological survey, except water related programs.

(e) Mining schools and experimental stations.

(f) Proposed long-range domestic minerals programs, including availability of domestic minerals to fulfill all domestic requirements.

(g) All measures and matters affecting geothermal resources.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION

(a) Measures and matters related to the National Park System and all of its units.

(b) National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; National Trails System; national recreation areas; and other national units established for protection, conservation, preservation, or recreational development not within the express jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Public Lands; and such military parks, battlefields, national cemeteries, and parks as the Secretary of the Interior may administer within the District of Columbia.

(c) National outdoor recreation plans, programs, and administration, including the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

(b)(1) In order to enable the Committee to carry out its responsibilities under Rule X, Clause 2 of the Rules of the House, each Subcommittee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of that Subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, each such Subcommittee shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of that Subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a

continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that Subcommittee.

(2) Pursuant to Rule X, Clause 2, of the Rules of the House, the Chair of the Committee and the Chair of the Subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter involved or their respective designees, shall meet with representatives of the Committee on Government Operations to discuss and to assist in coordinating oversight plans of their respective Committees.

Rule 18. Party Ratios.—The Chair shall negotiate with the Minority with respect to the size of each Subcommittee, with due regard for the preference of Members for Subcommittee assignments, except that party representation on each subcommittee shall be no less favorable to the Majority party than the ratio for the Committee.

The Chair, if approved by a majority of the Members of the Majority party, and the Ranking Minority Member, if approved by a majority of the Members of the Minority party, may serve as Members of each Subcommittee.

The size and party representation for each Subcommittee during the 99th Congress shall be as follows:

Subcommittee ¹	Total members	Majority party ²	Minority party ²
Energy and the Environment	25	15	10
Public Lands	19	11	8
General Oversight, Northwest Power, and Forest Management	10	6	4
Water and Power Resources	13	8	5
Mining and Natural Resources	7	4	3
National Parks and Recreation	20	12	8

¹ The Chair and ranking minority member of the full committee serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees, but are voting members only on the subcommittees to which they are assigned pursuant to rule 18.

² The Delegates from the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico do not count for purposes of the ratio between the majority and minority parties.

Rule 19. Special or Select Subcommittee.—The Chair is authorized, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, to appoint such special or select Subcommittees as he deems advisable for carrying out the responsibilities and functions of the Committee. Party representation on each such Subcommittee shall be in the same proportion as that on the Committee.

Rule 20. Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.—Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. The Chair of each Subcommittee shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittees after consultation with the Chair of the Full Committee and of other Subcommittees with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

Rule 21. Travel.—(a) Subcommittee hearings outside of Washington, D.C., and travel by Members and staff shall be subject to approval by the Chair of the Committee pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Committee on House Administration. Each Subcommittee Chair may, for the purposes of field trips or hearings outside of the District of Columbia, assign any Members of the Committee to that Subcommittee.

(b) Staff members assigned to any Subcommittee may travel in connection with their respective duties only with the approval of the appropriate Subcommittee Chair and with the approval of the Chair of the Committee. Prior to submitting such travel requests to the appropriate Subcommittee

Chair, all Minority staff travel shall be subject to such approval as the Minority Members of the Committee deem appropriate. All such travel shall be subject to the regulations promulgated by the Committee on House Administration.

Rule 22. Subcommittee Chair.—(a) The Majority Members of the Committee shall have the right, in order of Full Committee seniority, to bid for Standing Subcommittee Chairs. Any such bid shall be subject to approval by a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee. The Minority shall select a counterpart to the Subcommittee Chair for each of the Subcommittees. The Chair of select and special Subcommittees shall be appointed by the Chair of the Committee, subject to approval by a majority of the Majority Members of the Committee except that no Subcommittee Chair shall be Chair of another legislative Subcommittee of the House.

(b) Members chosen to Chair a Subcommittee shall retain a ranking position on not more than one other retained Subcommittee. Any Subcommittee Chair serving on more than two Subcommittees shall be assigned positions on additional Subcommittees only after all other Members are assigned to Subcommittees and their ranking established on such Subcommittee, then the Subcommittee Chairs may serve in the order of their ranking on the Committee.

Rule 23. Duties of Chair Upon Favorable Action by Committee.—Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee, the Chair shall report the same or designate some Member of the Committee to report the same to the House and shall use or cause to be used all parliamentary methods to secure passage thereof, without such additional authority being set forth particularly in the motion to report each individual bill or resolution. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the authority contained herein extends in appropriate cases to moving in accordance with Rule XXIV, Clause 5, of the said rules that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to consider the bill or resolution; and to moving in accordance with Rule XXIV, Clause 2, of said rules for the disposition of a Senate bill or resolution that is substantially the same as the House bill or resolution as reported.

Rule 24. Committee Budget and Expenses.—(a) Each Subcommittee Chair and the ranking Minority Members of the Committee shall submit to the Chair a budget for each session of the Congress covering the funding required for staff, travel, and miscellaneous expenses. The Chair shall prepare a consolidated budget for each session of Congress which shall include amounts required for all activities and programs of the Committee and the Subcommittees, except those Committee expenses to be paid from appropriations provided for by statute.

(b) Upon approval by the Committee of each such budget, the Chair, acting pursuant to Rule XI, Clause 5, of the Rules of the House, shall prepare and introduce in the House a supporting expense resolution, and take all action necessary to bring about its approval by the Committee on House Administration and by the House.

(c) The Chair shall report to the Committee any amendments to the Committee any amendments to each expense resolution and any changes in the budget necessitated thereby.

(d) Authorization for the payment of additional or unforeseen Committee and the

Subcommittee's expenses may be procured by one or more additional expense resolutions processed in the same manner as set out herein.

(e) Committee members shall be advised of the availability of each monthly report, prepared by the Chair for the Committee on House Administration, which shows expenditures made during the reporting period and cumulative for the year, anticipated expenditures for the projected Committee program, and detailed information on travel.

Rule 25. Recommendation of Conferees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, Majority Members shall be recommended to the Speaker as conferees as determined by the Majority, and Minority Members shall be recommended to the Speaker as conferees as determined by the Minority. Recommended party representation shall be in the same proportion as that in the Committee. ●

RULES OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS FOR THE 99TH CONGRESS

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the House of Representatives, herewith are submitted for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on Government Operations, which were adopted on February 6, 1985:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

RULE 1.—APPLICATION OF RULES

Except where the terms "full committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Government Operations and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen. [See House Rule XI, 1.]

RULE 2.—MEETINGS

The regular meetings of the full committee shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., except when Congress has adjourned. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee in accordance with the provisions of House Rule XI, 2(c)(2). Subcommittees shall meet at the call of the subcommittee chairmen. Every member of the committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days prior to each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The minority staff shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request. [See House Rule XI, 2(b).]

RULE 3.—QUORUMS

A majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one-third of the members shall consti-

tute a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation. Proxies shall not be used to establish a quorum. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting. [See House Rule XI, 2(h).]

RULE 4.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee shall be reported by the chairman in accordance with House Rule XI, 2(1).

Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present. Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed in accordance with House Rule XI, 2(1)(5). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views. A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) prior to the consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full committee. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the subcommittee or full committee prior to the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full committee.

RULE 5.—PROXY VOTES

A member may vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee and on any amendment or motion pertaining thereto. A proxy shall be in writing and be signed by the member granting the proxy; it shall show the date and time of day it was signed and the date for which it is given and the member to whom the proxy is given. Each proxy authorization shall state that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present; shall be limited to the date and the specific measure or matter to which it applies; and, unless it states otherwise, shall apply to any amendments or motions pertaining to the measure or matter. [See House Rule XI, 2(f).]

RULE 6.—ROLLCALLS

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of any member. [See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

RULE 7.—RECORD OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions including a record of the rollcall votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement. [See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

RULE 8.—SUBCOMMITTEES; REFERRALS

There shall be seven subcommittees with appropriate party ratios which shall have fixed jurisdictions. Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be referred by the chairman to subcommittees within two weeks for

consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee. [See House Rule XI, 1(a)(2).]

RULE 9.—EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony.

RULE 10.—STAFF

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the chairman of the full committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full committee and of subcommittees subject to appropriate approval.

RULE 11.—STAFF DIRECTION

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule XI, 5 and 6, the staff of the committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

RULE 12.—HEARING DATES AND WITNESSES

The chairman of the full committee will announce the date, place, and subject matter of all hearings at least one week prior to the commencement of any hearings, unless he determines that there is good cause to begin such hearings at an earlier date. In order that the chairman of the full committee may coordinate the committee facilities and hearing plans, each subcommittee chairman shall notify him of any hearing plans at least two weeks in advance of the date of commencement of hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent he is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request. The minority members shall supply the names of witnesses they intend to call to the chairman of the full committee or subcommittee at the earliest possible date. Witnesses appearing before the committee shall, so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours in advance of their appearance. [See House Rule XI, 2 (g)(3), (g)(4), (j), and (k).]

RULE 13.—OPEN MEETINGS

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives. [See House Rule XI, 2 (g) and (k).]

RULE 14.—FIVE-MINUTE RULE

A committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman

for that purpose. In accordance with House Rule XI, 2(j)(2), each committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately on the basis of seniority those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others on the basis of their arrival at the hearing. Thereafter, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

RULE 15.—INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS; PROCEDURE

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witness.

RULE 16.—STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

RULE 17.—TV, RADIO, AND PHOTOGRAPHS

When approved by a majority vote, an open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, 3. In order to enforce the provisions of said rule or to maintain an acceptable standard of dignity, propriety, and decorum, the chairman may order such alteration, curtailment, or discontinuance of coverage as he determines necessary.

RULE 18.—ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF CHAIRMAN

The chairman of the full committee shall:

- (a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, 4(c)(2);

- (b) Arrange such meetings, designate participants and submit such reports to the House as may be necessary to carry out the coordination of oversight activities and reporting requirements under House Rule X, 2(c);

- (c) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, 2(d);

- (d) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, 4(g), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

- (e) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the committee; and

- (f) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and the minority, a budget for the committee which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities.

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. DEWINE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. MICHEL, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PERKINS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRATTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FASCELL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PRICE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STOKES, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. BARNES, for 60 minutes, on February 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. STOKES, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,447.

Mr. McDADE, on the subject of the special order of Mr. WALKER today.

Mr. GEKAS, on the subject of the special order of Mr. WALKER today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEWINE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.
Mr. PORTER in two instances.
Mr. LENT in four instances.
Mr. HYDE in two instances.
Mr. RUDD.
Mr. McGRATH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PERKINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES.
Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. STARK in two instances.
Mr. MITCHELL.
Ms. OAKAR.
Mr. MARKEY.
Mr. COYNE.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mrs. KENNELLY.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. BEILSON.
Mr. HALL of Ohio in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mrs. BYRON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until to-

morrow, Thursday, February 21, 1985, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

568. A letter from the Executive Associate Director for Budget and Legislation, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting facts in the case of an apportionment which would indicate the necessity of a supplemental estimate, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

569. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the 1985 Budget supplemental for the District of Columbia, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 446; Public Law 98-125, section 114 (H. Doc. No. 99-30); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on active duty strength level of components of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and base structure, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 138(c)(3) (93 Stat. 806; 94 Stat. 2840); to the Committee on Armed Services.

571. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on active duty strength level of components of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel and base structure, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 138(c)(3) (93 Stat. 806; 94 Stat. 2840); to the Committee on Armed Services.

572. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a proposed transfer of functions currently assigned to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Installations, and Logistics to the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 125(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

573. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

574. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report entitled: "The U.S. Automobile Industry, 1983," pursuant to Public Law 96-185, section 12(b); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

575. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Energy transmitting a notice of meetings of the International Energy Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

576. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting an extension of a deadline in a rail carrier proceeding, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10327(k)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

577. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting an extension of a deadline in a rail carrier proceeding, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10327(k)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

578. A letter from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation amending the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 to authorize ad-

ditional sums for fiscal year 1987; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

579. A letter from the Program Manager, Employee Benefits Division, NAF Personnel Directorate, Department of the Army, transmitting the U.S. Army nonappropriated fund [NAF] employee retirement plan for fiscal year 1983, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

580. A letter from the Secretary, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting an annual evaluation of compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

581. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of threatened areas on the Registry of National Landmarks and threatened areas of national significance on the National Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Public Law 91-383, section 8(a), (90 Stat. 1940; 94 Stat. 68, 1135); Public Law 97-100, section 108; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

582. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science, transmitting a hydrologic determination regarding the Navajo Reservoir, pursuant to Public Law 87-483; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

583. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Marine Fisheries Program Authorization Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

584. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting several prospectuses proposing building projects or leases, pursuant to Public Law 86-249, section 7(a) (86 Stat. 217); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

585. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a report on the origin, contents, destination, and disposition of all humanitarian foods and supplies transported by military transport to Central America, pursuant to section 1540 of the 1985 Department of Defense Authorization Act; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

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:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 1153. A bill to provide additional emergency credit to farm producers; to provide funds to forego foreclosure and defer payment of indebtedness; and to determine damages caused by embargoes on the sale and delivery of agricultural commodities, either through direct embargo or failure to sell competitively; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BEILENSEN:

H.R. 1154. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act to require that the motor vehicle bumper standard established by the Secretary of Transportation shall be restored to that in effect January 1, 1982; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1155. A bill to provide emergency credit and debt adjustment relief to financially stressed farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Small Business.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1156. A bill to coordinate and expand services for the prevention, identification, treatment, and followup care of alcohol and drug abuse among Indian youth, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 1157. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1986 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Maritime Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1158. A bill to provide for the betterment of faculty development and university administration in certain countries in the Caribbean region and Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Illinois:

H.R. 1159. A bill to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act of 1982; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1160. A bill to provide that the availability of extended and supplemental unemployment benefits shall be determined by using the total unemployment rate and that such benefits may be made available on an area basis within a State, and to extend the supplemental unemployment program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.R. 1161. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow members of the Armed Forces to sue the United States for damages for certain injuries caused by improper medical care; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 1162. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to control certain sources of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides to reduce acid deposition and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. RUDD, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. COBEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. MONSON):

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for State establishment of maximum speed limits not in excess of 70 miles per hour for portions of public highways located outside of traffic-congested areas; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HARTNETT (for himself, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr.

SPRATT, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. KINDNESS):

H.R. 1164. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may authorize certain reserve officers who are employed as military technicians to be retained in an active status until age 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii:

H.R. 1165. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to broaden the income tax base, to lower tax rates, and achieve a more neutral tax system by imposing a fair and simple progressive cash flow income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 1166. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to liberalize certain provisions authorizing reimbursement for expenses of sale and purchase of a residence upon the transfer of a Federal employee; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 1167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow certain individuals who have attained age 65 or who are disabled a refundable tax credit for property taxes paid by them on their principal residence or for a certain portion of the rent they pay on their principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1168. A bill to investigate alternatives to the institutionalization of medicare and medicaid patients; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H.R. 1169. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include service during World War II in the U.S. merchant marine as military service for purposes of the civil service retirement system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. HYDE):

H.R. 1170. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act to limit the growth of Federal spending and achieve balanced budgets, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Rules and Government Operations.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 1171. A bill to improve the collection of statistics on crimes motivated by racial, religious, or ethnic hatred by requiring the Attorney General to include in the uniform crime reports information describing the incidence of certain offenses involving the expression of racial, ethnic, or religious prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN of Florida:

H.R. 1172. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include, as a home health service, nutritional counseling provided by or under the supervision of a registered dietitian; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINNEY (for himself and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 1174. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 with respect to the export of domestically produced crude oil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1175. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for full and

effective competition in international telecommunications markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1176. A bill to assist small business, independent investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1177. A bill to provide for the establishment of revitalization areas in distressed areas, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and to amend the Small Business Act to provide tax incentives and loan proceeds for development in revitalization areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. BEDELL):

H.R. 1178. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for equity in the establishment of small business size standards; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1179. A bill to provide for payment to persons who served during World War II as Philippine Scouts the difference between the pay of such Philippine Scouts and the pay for the same period of other members of the Armed Forces of the United States of corresponding grades and length of service and to equalize the retired pay of such persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 1180. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code for the purpose of requiring that the minimum age established by a State law for persons purchasing, possessing, or consuming alcoholic beverages shall be the minimum age for such persons on military installations in such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 1181. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for general revenue sharing for 5 years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSE (for himself, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi):

H.R. 1182. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to temporarily prohibit hostile corporate takeovers of domestic petroleum corporations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 1183. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage increases in productivity by special tax treatment for certain employee bonuses which are determined on the basis of profits or cost savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 1184. A bill to provide emergency credit to financially stressed farmers and ranchers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. RUDD):

H.R. 1185. A bill to amend the act establishing the Petrified Forest National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from a taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income the amount of interest received or accrued by the taxpayer in determining whether the taxpayer's social security benefits or railroad retirement benefits are to be included in gross income subject to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning September 1, 1985, as "National Pedestrian Safety Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on April 1, 1985, as "National Philippine Veteran Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 12, 1985, as "National Digestive Diseases Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STALLINGS:

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EVANS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to using the total unemployment rate as the basis for determining the availability of extended and supplemental benefits for the unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii:

H. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution calling for a 1-year freeze in real Federal spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of Congress regarding periods of silence in the public schools; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois):

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution concerning United States-Japan trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Res. 62. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Government Operations in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H. Res. 64. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Education and Labor in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H. Res. 65. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mrs. BURTON of California introduced a bill (H.R. 1187) for the relief of Fung Ping Lee; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 26: Mr. COYNE, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 99: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 153: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 346: Mr. YATES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ROE, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 423: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 511: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 524: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 535: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 568: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 787: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H.R. 849: Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. REID, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 915: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ROE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 917: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 998: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1000: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 1006: Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 1079: Mr. ADDABBO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1086: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. DAUB, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HILER, Mr. LENT, Mr. COATS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SWINDALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BATES, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.J. Res. 74: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOODY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. RUDD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. EARLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FOWLER, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. FRANK, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.J. Res. 121: Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. KEMP, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. FROST, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. STRANG, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. REID, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FISH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DYSON, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BEIL-ENSON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONKER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr.

COELHO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HEFTTEL of Hawaii, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. O'BRIEN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WISE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. MARLENEE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MANTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SABO, Mr. EARLY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Res. 20: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. LENT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GALLO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LUKEN, and Mr. BOSCO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

39. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the State Board of Administration of Florida, Tallahassee, FL, relative to the assets of the Florida retirement system trust fund, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.