

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 26, 1985

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Hendrik Laur, Gull Harbor Lutheran Church, Olympia, WA, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, with trust in You, we look to the future. May that trust be not only a motto on our coins. May it be impressed on our hearts as we order the affairs of our beloved Nation.

We thank You for the freedom to thank You—or to refrain from thanksgiving, if so we choose. We pray for those who do not have that right. We think especially of the Estonian people, who celebrate a brief flowering of freedom so quickly quenched by foreign aggression. Grant that freedom be not the privilege of a few, but the right of all.

As now each in our own way, we ask for Your blessing, grant us to be a blessing for each other and for all our people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 162, answered "present" 2, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—224

Addabbo	Bedell	Boucher
Akaka	Beilenson	Boxer
Alexander	Bennett	Breaux
Anderson	Berman	Brooks
Andrews	Bevill	Brown (CA)
Anthony	Biaggi	Broyhill
Applegate	Boggs	Bruce
Aspin	Boland	Bryant
Atkins	Boner (TN)	Burton (CA)
AuCoin	Bonior (MI)	Bustamante
Barnard	Bonker	Byron
Barnes	Borski	Carper
Bates	Bosco	Carr

Chappell	Jenkins	Richardson
Coelho	Jones (NC)	Rodino
Coleman (MO)	Jones (OK)	Roe
Coleman (TX)	Jones (TN)	Rose
Collins	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Cooper	Kastenmeier	Rowland (GA)
Coyne	Kennelly	Roybal
Crockett	Kildee	Russo
Daniel	Klecza	Sabo
Darden	Kolter	Savage
Daschle	LaFalce	Scheuer
de la Garza	Leath (TX)	Schneider
Dellums	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Derrick	Lehman (FL)	Seiberling
Dicks	Leland	Sharp
Dixon	Levin (MI)	Shelby
Donnelly	Levine (CA)	Sisisky
Dorgan (ND)	Lipinski	Skelton
Dowdy	Lloyd	Slattery
Downey	Lundine	Smith (IA)
Durbin	MacKay	Snyder
Dwyer	Manton	Solarz
Dyson	Markey	Spratt
Early	Martinez	St Germain
Eckart (OH)	Matsui	Staggers
Edgar	Mazzoli	Stark
Edwards (CA)	McCurdy	Stenholm
English	McHugh	Stokes
Erdreich	Mica	Stratton
Evans (IL)	Mikulski	Studds
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Swift
Feighan	Mineta	Synar
Flippo	Mitchell	Tallon
Florio	Moakley	Tauzin
Foglietta	Mollohan	Taylor
Foley	Montgomery	Thomas (GA)
Ford (TN)	Moody	Torres
Fowler	Morrison (CT)	Torrice
Frank	Mrazek	Traxler
Frost	Murphy	Udall
Fuqua	Murtha	Valentine
Gaydos	Natcher	Vento
Gejdenson	Neal	Visclosky
Gibbons	Nelson	Volkmer
Glickman	Nichols	Walgren
Gonzalez	Nowak	Watkins
Gordon	Oakar	Weiss
Gradison	Oberstar	Wheat
Hall (OH)	Obey	Whitley
Hall, Ralph	Olin	Whitten
Hall, Sam	Ortiz	Williams
Hamilton	Owens	Wilson
Hawkins	Panetta	Wirth
Hayes	Parris	Wise
Hefner	Pease	Wolpe
Hertel	Pepper	Wright
Horton	Perkins	Wyden
Howard	Pickle	Wyllie
Hoyer	Price	Yates
Hubbard	Rahall	Yatron
Hughes	Rangel	Young (MO)
Hutto	Reid	

NAYS—162

Army	Cobey	Fiedler
Badham	Coble	Fields
Bartlett	Combest	Fish
Barton	Conte	Franklin
Bateman	Coughlin	Gallo
Bentley	Craig	Gekas
Bereuter	Dannemeyer	Gilman
Billirakis	Daub	Goodling
Billey	Davis	Green
Broomfield	DeLay	Gregg
Brown (CO)	DeWine	Grotberg
Burton (IN)	Dickinson	Gunderson
Callahan	DioGuardi	Hammerschmidt
Campbell	Dornan (CA)	Hansen
Campbell	Dreier	Hendon
Carney	Duncan	Henry
Chandler	Eckert (NY)	Hiler
Chapple	Edwards (OK)	Hopkins
Cheney	Emerson	Huckaby
Clay	Evans (IA)	Hunter
Clinger	Fawell	Hyde
Coats		

Ireland	Michel	Shaw
Jacobs	Miller (OH)	Shumway
Jeffords	Miller (WA)	Shuster
Kasich	Molinari	Sikorski
Kemp	Moore	Siljander
Kindness	Moorhead	Skeen
Kolbe	Morrison (WA)	Slaughter
Kramer	Myers	Smith (NE)
Lagomarsino	Nielson	Smith (NH)
Latta	O'Brien	Smith (NJ)
Leach (IA)	Oxley	Smith, Denny
Lent	Packard	Smith, Robert
Lewis (CA)	Pashayan	Snowe
Lewis (FL)	Penny	Solomon
Lightfoot	Petri	Spence
Livingston	Porter	Stangeland
Loeffler	Pursell	Strang
Lott	Quillen	Stump
Lowery (CA)	Regula	Sundquist
Lujan	Rinaldo	Sweeney
Luken	Ritter	Swindall
Lungren	Roberts	Tauke
Mack	Roemer	Thomas (CA)
Marlenee	Rogers	Vucanovich
Martin (NY)	Roukema	Walker
McCain	Rowland (CT)	Weber
McCandless	Rudd	Whitehurst
McColum	Saxton	Whittaker
McDade	Schaefer	Wolf
McEwen	Schroeder	Wortley
McGrath	Schuetze	Young (AK)
McKernan	Schulze	Young (FL)
McKinney	Sensenbrenner	Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Conyers Gingrich

NOT VOTING—44

Ackerman	Gray (PA)	McMillan
Annunzio	Guarini	Meyers
Archer	Hartnett	Monson
Boehert	Hatcher	Ray
Boulter	Heftel	Ridge
Courter	Hillis	Robinson
Crane	Holt	Roth
Dingell	Johnson	Smith (FL)
Dymally	Kaptur	Stallings
Fascell	Kostmayer	Towns
Ford (MI)	Lantos	Trafficant
Frenzel	Lowry (WA)	Vander Jagt
Garcia	Madigan	Waxman
Gephardt	Martin (IL)	Weaver
Gray (IL)	Mavroules	

□ 1220

Messrs. MOORE and ECKERT of New York changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REV. HENDRIK LAUR

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

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am substituting this morning for my good friend and colleague, the Honorable DON BONKER, Congressman from Washington's Third District.

It is my honor to introduce Rev. Hendrik Laur. Reverend Laur was born in Estonia in 1937 in the face of the Russian invasion. He and his mother fled to Germany in the fall of

□ 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.

1944. After the end of the war, they remained in DP camps until it was possible for them to come to the United States in May 1950, and they settled in Olympia, WA, at that time.

In 1968, Reverend Laur was asked by the Division for World Mission and Ecumenism of the Lutheran Church in America to serve in South America where there was a need for an Estonian-speaking pastor. He returned to the United States in 1973, and organized the Gull Harbor Lutheran Church as a new mission of the Pacific Northwest Synod of the Lutheran Church in America. He is currently serving as the pastor of that congregation.

I simply want to conclude by saying on behalf of my colleague, Congressman BONKER, it is a great pleasure to welcome Reverend Laur to the House Chamber today.

REQUEST TO DISPENSE WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY ON TOMORROW

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on tomorrow, February 27, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR TAKING OF OFFICIAL PICTURES OF THE HOUSE WHILE IN ACTUAL SESSION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 78) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 78

Resolved, That at a time designated by the Speaker, the United States Capitol Historical Society shall be permitted to take official pictures of the House while in actual session for inclusion in the new editions of "We the People" and "The Capitol". The pictures shall also be available for legitimate nonprofit news and educational purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House consider the resolution? The Chair hears none.

Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with the noise in the Chamber I could not hear the

character of the resolution. Could the Chair at least inform me what the resolution is about?

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is to authorize the taking of the annual picture.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will Mr. McIntyre and Mr. McCloskey be included in that picture?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The picture is to include Members of Congress who are to be seated in the Chamber.

Mr. WALKER. Well, that does not answer my question. Would Mr. McIntyre be eligible for being included in the official picture?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Well, is Mr. McIntyre a Member of Congress?

Mr. WALKER. He was elected as a Member of Congress and has been certified as a Member of Congress. That is my question.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the picture is to be taken of Members of Congress.

Mr. WALKER. Well, that still does not answer my question. Is Mr. McIntyre going to be included in that picture?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I will write the gentleman a letter in great detail to explain it. Obviously, a simple explanation is insufficient.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Mr. McIntyre would not be allowed to have his picture taken with the official picture of this House?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will be pleased to respond further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman further reserving his right to object?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I further reserve the right to object. I yielded to the gentleman from New York, and I would say to the gentleman from New York that that is my understanding about what the gentleman from Arkansas is saying; he refuses to say so directly.

□ 1230

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate going on for days and days now. I can tell you here is one Republican who will refuse to come to the floor and have his picture taken unless Mr. McIntyre is here, and I would suggest that all Republicans stay off the floor and let us have it only one sided.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, that is the gentleman's right, to refuse to be in the picture, but it is not the right of any nonmember of Congress to be included in the picture.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, then I do

assume that the gentleman is referring to Mr. McIntyre as a nonmember of Congress.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct.

Mr. WALKER. That is correct. All right, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object for just a moment, we are simply at this point talking about the reading. We have not at this point talked about consideration, have we?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the resolution?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would want the Chair to put the question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be withdrawn and the matter be considered at a later time.

Mr. WALKER. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has the right to withdraw the resolution at this stage of the proceedings.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1035, FARM EMERGENCY CREDIT ACT OF 1935

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-7) on the resolution (H. Res. 79) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1035) to provide emergency credit and debt adjustment relief to financially stressed farmers and ranchers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

KEITH FREDRICK MAINLAND

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I call to the attention of the House the retirement of one of our finest public servants, Keith Mainland, as chief of staff of our Committee on Appropriations. We are proud of our committee staff. It is profes-

sional and objective in its work. It is thorough and does the impossible in bringing together the financial figures on all the Government, on short notice, frequently working all night to get the job done.

Keith Mainland in his years of service has truly represented the best of a fine staff.

As a man, and as a friend, I have truly enjoyed my association with Keith in the years he has been with the Committee on Appropriations.

As much as we regret his retirement, we must agree that he has earned it.

We wish for Keith and his fine family the best of everything in the years ahead.

I would like to read to the membership the resolution which was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—RESOLUTIONS IN TRIBUTE TO KEITH FREDRICK MAINLAND

Whereas, Keith Fredrick Mainland, after twenty-eight years of service to the Government and people of the United States, is retiring as the eighth Clerk and Staff Director of the Committee on Appropriations, and

Whereas, the service of Mr. Mainland to the Committee on Appropriations has been distinguished by unsurpassed loyalty, integrity, and capability, and

Whereas, the unflagging courtesy, devotion to duty, and dedication to the national interest demonstrated by Mr. Mainland have set a new standard difficult to emulate, and

Whereas, the sound judgment and wise counsel of Mr. Mainland is universally respected and will be greatly missed; therefore, be it now

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations expresses its utmost gratitude for his contributions, its sincere regret at his departure, and the best wishes of the Members to Keith Fredrick Mainland for a long and happy retirement, and be it now further

Resolved, That the Committee direct the Chairman to convey to Mr. Mainland the expression of good will and heartfelt gratitude of the Members and communicate to him a copy of these resolutions.

Adopted by the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, *Chairman*.
FEBRUARY 21, 1985.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to join my chairman and other members of the committee in a tribute to Keith Mainland, the eighth clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, who will retire at the end of this month after 28 years of distinguished service to his country.

Keith began that service as an enlisted man in the Marine Corps in 1951. He was commissioned in 1953, and served in Korea. Keith was a budget analyst at GSA from 1958 to 1962, and was detailed to the Commit-

tee on Appropriations in 1962, when he was appointed to the staff of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, chaired by Albert Thomas of Texas. He was appointed the clerk of the committee by George Mahon in October of 1972.

Keith is the eighth clerk to serve the members of this committee in the 120 years since the committee was established in 1865.

Throughout those years this committee has had—and has today—the most competent staff in the legislative branch.

With the support of George Mahon and Jamie Whitten, Keith has maintained the high standards that we have come to take for granted.

Keith and the staff have kept faith with the members of the committee, and the Members of the House, and that faith can be reduced to three words: professionalism, integrity, competence.

The most fitting tribute to Keith as a person is the words that Paul wrote to Timothy: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

I have treasured Keith's friendship, as well as his counsel, and I speak from my heart when I wish Keith and his family happiness and prosperity in the years ahead.

KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join with other members of the Committee on Appropriations in this tribute to Keith Mainland. Keith Mainland, the chief clerk and staff director of the House Committee on Appropriations, is retiring after 23 years of service.

I suspect that there is virtually no Member of this body who doesn't know Keith. We often hear the expression that no one is indispensable and I expect that is also true of Keith. But in all my years of service here I can't think of any staff member who has contributed more to making this institution work.

Each year Members take the floor to complain about the passage of massive continuing resolutions. But without the enactment of those resolutions, the Government would come to a grinding halt. And without Keith Mainland's gentle but steady leadership of the staff of the Appropriations Committee, those massive pieces of legislation could never have been enacted.

During consideration of the continuing resolution, no matter if Keith had been here for 3 days without sleep—he was never too busy to talk to any member about any subject or any problem. It's true—no one is indispen-

sable—but we will all miss Keith's capabilities and his sense of excellence. And in my mind, this institution is a lesser place with his departure.

I first met Keith when he showed up for work in the Independent Agencies Subcommittee 23 years ago. He trained for 4 years under the strong leadership of Albert Thomas of Texas, one of the giants of this body, a giant in intellect and a giant in physical stature. From there he went on to serve 6 years with Chairman Mahon until he was appointed clerk and staff director in October 1972. During all those years he was first, last, and always a true professional—and he never wavered in his loyalty to this House.

Keith will now have a chance to spend a little more time with his wife, Sandy, and his son, Kirk—and maybe do some fishing, and get out and watch his daughter, Marlene, play basketball for Georgia Tech. Let me assure you—he has earned it.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to wish Keith and Sandy and their family many years of happiness and good health.

Best of luck to him.

□ 1240

IN HONOR OF THE RETIREMENT OF KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I am very privileged today to spend a few moments in joining in tribute to our good friend and clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Keith Mainland. After his long and distinguished career of providing service to the committee, Keith is getting his well-deserved chance to enjoy the beautiful Virginia countryside and to do battle with that illusive bass. We wish him well in this endeavor.

Keith is more than just a staff member who is retiring after good and faithful service to the Congress. Since the Appropriations Committee was established in 1865, only eight men have served as its chief clerk.

Keith came to Congress in 1962 when Clarence Cannon appointed him to the Deficiency Subcommittee on the Appropriations staff. That subcommittee, now known as the HUD and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, was the launching point for his term of service in Congress. In October of 1972, our good friend and former colleague, Chairman George Mahon, appointed Keith as clerk of the full Appropriations Committee.

Throughout his public service, Keith has served in an exemplary and distinguished manner. I join all of the members of the Appropriations Committee

in wishing Keith, his wife Sandy, his son Kirk, and his daughter Marlene, the very best as he takes this opportunity to carry on with his new ventures. He will be missed.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, in describing an outstanding staff member, you would use such words as loyal, dedicated, qualified and able, and this description would certainly describe our friend, Keith Mainland.

Keith Mainland's service as chief clerk of the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives will be one of the bright spots in the history of our committee. Under Keith Mainland's supervision, the entire staff of the Appropriations Committee functioned as it should and made this one of the best committees in the House of Representatives.

His concept of public trust has been without parallel and never has he hesitated to speak out against any proposal which he felt was not sound and in the best interests of the Appropriations Committee. Words are inadequate to fully apprise his tremendous capacity for loyalty and love of the Appropriations Committee.

I have served, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 30 years and during this period of time, we have had a number of chief clerks. None were better qualified and none acquired more success with the other staff members than Keith Mainland.

We will miss him, Mr. Speaker. I want to wish for my friend, Keith Mainland, and the members of his family the best of everything in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, Voltaire said: "In general, the art of government consists in taking as much money as possible from one class of citizens to give to the other." The committee which does the "giving" is the Appropriations Committee. It has done its job so well in large part due to the assistance of Keith Mainland. I want to join with my colleagues here today in saluting Keith on his retirement as clerk and staff director.

Born in Illinois in 1932, Keith received his bachelor of science degree from Northwestern University and served in the Marine Corps in Korea.

Unlike some staff members who are impressed with what they think is their own importance, Keith has kept a low profile and an unassuming attitude. The fact that he has not sought the limelight is the key to his great effectiveness. Keith has extensive experience with the Federal budget and superb knowledge of parliamentary procedure.

All of us appreciate the wisdom of his counsel and his coolness under fire, especially during the marathon continuing resolution sessions at the end of the fiscal year. However, the work of appropriations goes on year round—hearings, supplementals, regular bills, oversite. Keith is constantly called on to assist Congress in fulfilling its constitutionally mandated duty of spending the taxpayers' money. He does a splendid job.

While the members of the staff of the Appropriations Committee will miss Keith very much, we wish him the best in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, really almost nothing can be added to what has already been said, but I especially want to endorse every word in the resolution read by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Keith Mainland has been an excellent staff director, as good a staff director as any committee ever had. He has been a model for integrity, professionalism, and competence, and his contributions to the legislative accomplishments have been great.

Although we understand his desire to retire, we are sorry to see him leave. I wish him well and, Mr. Speaker, I add my accolades to those that have already been given.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND—NATIONAL ASTHMA AND ALLERGY AWARENESS WEEK

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

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to add my words of praise to those that have been said about Keith Mainland, a highly intelligent, scholarly, and hard-working staff director and a man blessed with a great sense of fairness. He typifies what may be one of the great assets of this House, a top quality director of a top quality staff.

I wish him well, and, like others, I will truly miss his considerate and invaluable help.

Mr. Speaker, on an unrelated matter, today I have introduced a

joint resolution designating the week beginning May 5, 1985, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week."

Asthma and allergic diseases result in physical, emotional, and economic burdens for more than 35 million American children and adults and their families. Thousands of Americans, many of them young, die each year from asthma despite the fact that knowledge and resources exist to prevent many of these deaths.

We know that allergic diseases, including most of the asthma experienced by youth and some forms of the adult asthma, are disorders of the immune system. Science has made remarkable gains in helping American health care providers improve diagnoses and treatment of asthma and allergic disease through increased knowledge in the field of immunology. Medications developed in recent years enable many asthmatic and allergic Americans to lead more normal lives with fewer disturbing side effects. The growth in understanding the human immune system results from the work of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, private sources, and volunteer health agencies such as the American Academy of Allergy and Immunology and the Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America.

We commend these dedicated volunteer groups and scientists that devote their efforts to conquering asthma and allergic diseases. We also admire the resourcefulness of patients and their families in overcoming these disorders and helping others in dealing with the effects of these widespread afflictions.

The speed of new scientific knowledge about asthma and allergic disorders often surpasses its understanding and application by many health care providers and patients. Unfortunately, there are still misconceptions concerning asthma and allergic disorders which create continued and undue hardships for millions of Americans.

To emphasize the importance of public education and awareness and to encourage the continued public and private support of research into these disorders, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the resolution.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in Congress and, more specifically, on the Appropriations Committee in today saluting Keith Mainland for his loyal, diligent service to the Appropriations Commit-

tee for all the years that I have served there.

Members of Congress in most cases are no better than the staffs that they associate with. In every instance Keith Mainland has served the Appropriations Committee, on every occasion, with competence, with diligence, with integrity, and with a sense of duty that is to be emulated by other staff assistants throughout the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well. I am sorry he is leaving, but I applaud his departure with the fond memories of our association over the last number of years.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, let me add my "amen" to all of the accolades that have been stated here during this period of recognition for the yeoman service of Keith Mainland.

I would just make one further point, and that is this: That Keith Mainland provided counsel with intellectual integrity free from ideology as he served all members of the Appropriations Committee.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to pay my tribute to Keith Mainland upon his retirement.

I have known Keith for 15 years, and in the over 15 years I have served on the committee, it has had only two chief clerks. Under his tenure the Appropriations Committee has produced approximately 200 major appropriation bills.

I think during that time Keith has seen many changes. Some he has liked and some he has disliked, but in all of it he has remained loyal, he has remained a fierce defender of this institution, and he is one of the reasons this institution works.

I think in many ways Keith reflects the nature of the Appropriations Committee and its process. There are many committees in this institution that are more glamorous and are more in the public eye, but in the end of the Appropriations Committee usually, after all of the politics is done, has to deal with the practicalities that are presented us at the time, and that is Keith's style. He has throughout his career continually tried to do what must be done in order to keep the Government functioning.

Mr. Speaker, I wish him well in his retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND UPON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I join in the comments that have been made about Keith Mainland. One of the things that I have observed in the 9 years that I have been a Member of Congress is that none of us who are elected can do the job by ourselves. We need the help of very talented, competent professional staff assistants that we can depend upon.

Since I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have found that that committee's staff under Mr. Mainland's direction has established a very high standard, not only for competence and professionalism but for bipartisanship. During the time I have been on the committee I have been very impressed by the fact that the staff under Mr. Mainland's direction has worked very well to serve Members of both parties in trying to do their work on that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss him, as I am sure other members of the committee will.

□ 1250

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I join with the chairman and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in commemorating the retirement of Keith Mainland. All of us who serve on this committee will certainly miss the service which he rendered to this great committee and to each of us for so many years.

Keith Mainland is one of those highly competent and professional staff directors who made a significant impact and imprint upon the work of this congressional committee and the Congress. Keith's knowledge of the appropriations process and the rules and regulations applicable to the process, along with the individual attention and cooperation he gave each Member, was a keystone of his success. His efficiency will be long remembered by all of us.

As one who benefited from this loyal and dedicated public servant, I want to wish him all success in his retirement and the pursuit of any new endeavors which he may undertake.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in saluting Keith Mainland, chief of staff of our committee, on his retirement.

Longevity is a quality highly valued in congressional staff, but it is one that, because of the nature of our work, is rarely seen. Keith has served the committee since March 1962, and has served the committee excellently. All too often we overlook the many sacrifices that our staff members make and take for granted their contribution to making this body work. Keith, by any standard, has been an exemplary employee. He has expended every effort to assure the smooth working of the Appropriations Committee, and the reputation that the committee staff has for professionalism is testament to his leadership as staff director.

Mr. Speaker, as others have mentioned, the Appropriations Committee, since its inception in 1865, has had only eight chief clerks. This is a fine record that has given our committee great stability, an important asset to any committee in Congress. I know all Members join me in wishing Keith and his family the best of luck in the future. He will certainly be missed, but his contributions to the Appropriations Committee and the House will certainly endure.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. EARLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my Committee on Appropriation colleagues in this well deserved tribute to Keith Mainland, chief administrator of the appropriations staff, on his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, everyone is replaceable, just some are more difficult to replace. I think Keith Mainland will be one of the most difficult to replace. He is truly an outstanding, dedicated, and consistent man.

In my 10 years on this committee, Keith Mainland has been the only chief of staff I have known. I consider it an honor and a pleasure that I have had the opportunity to work with Keith Mainland and to know him as a friend.

KEITH MAINLAND

(Mr. LEHMAN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEHMAN OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the history of the Committee on Appropriations, there have been only a few clerks—Keith Mainland, who is retiring at the end of this month, is the eighth.

Many other members, some of whom have served far longer on the committee than I have, have spoken of Keith's loyalty to the committee and the Congress, his integrity, and his competence in serving the Members, our staffs, the House, and the people.

What I will always remember about Keith's tenure is that however tense, controversial, or fatiguing our situation was, Keith never lost his cool, his perspective, or that twinkle in his eye. He made my job, and, I suspect, the jobs of all my committee colleagues, easier and a lot more enjoyable.

While Keith may not miss those late-night continuing resolution conferences, we will miss Keith.

I wish Keith Mainland all the best in his new endeavors, and hope we will continue to see him often.

KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues before me, I take this occasion to salute Keith Mainland, the clerk of the Appropriations Committee. I have served on that committee for some 10 years. It has been my pleasure to have worked very closely with Mr. Mainland. I wish to assure the Members of this body that he has led a very highly professional staff that has always acted in a bipartisan manner to develop appropriation bills that are in the best interest of this Congress and of the Nation.

He will be retiring at the end of this month, and his departure will be sorely missed by many of us who admire him not only for his professionalism but as an individual. I have been very pleased and proud over the last 10 years to call Keith a friend and to know him not only professionally but personally. He is an outstanding individual whose presence will be sorely missed. I wish him well in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members of the House Appropriations Committee for taking this time to honor our able staff director, Keith Mainland. I rise today and

join with my colleagues to praise and commend Keith, who will be retiring at the end of this month after 22 years of dedicated and professional service to our committee.

In my 4 years with the Appropriations Committee, I quickly learned how important our staff is to the work of our committee. Without question, being a member of the Appropriations Committee is one of the toughest assignments in Congress. The same is true for our staff. I never fail to be impressed with the knowledge, experience and dedication of our committee staff. Keith Mainland represents the best our staff has to offer. All the members of our committee know and appreciate the long hours of hard work, often into the early hours of the morning, as members and staff labored to report out our bills and complete action on continuing resolutions. He has served with distinction throughout these difficult budget years.

While we will all miss Keith's valuable service to the committee, we know from the praise he has received today that he is retiring secure in the knowledge that when the challenges came, he met them in the highest tradition of professionalism.

Keith, I wish you a fond aloha and mahalo for everything you have done for our committee, and for me as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Thanks for a job well done.

KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret that we witness the retirement of Keith Mainland, who has served on the staff of the Appropriations Committee since 1962, and as its clerk since 1972—only the eighth clerk that committee has had since it was established in 1865.

As a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I was very grateful for all of Keith's assistance, which was particularly invaluable to me in terms of learning the initial ropes of the committee and its procedures. In addition, as a freshman Member of Congress, Keith helped me learn the congressional budget and appropriations process, for which I am extremely grateful. I only wish that I could have received his counsel for the duration of my first term on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, this committee will surely miss Keith Mainland, who has set an example for all of us in dedication, professionalism, and service to this institution. I would only wish him and his family well and the best of success in his future endeavors, and the sincere congratulations for a job extremely well done.

A TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

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

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to add my comments in honoring the recently retired clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations, Keith Mainland.

Keith has always embodied the best traits of the best committee staff in the House, the Appropriations staff. In fact, he has served as an example to the many staff who have worked with the committee.

Keith set standards for hard work, dedication to his job, and his colleagues, and cooperation with the several dozen members of the committee that many others would find hard to meet. If his patience ran short, as I am sure it often did, he never revealed it publicly. Similarly, he maintained his sense of professionalism in less trying situations.

In my 4 years on the Appropriations Committee, I have enjoyed and appreciated Keith's top-notch work as clerk and staff director. I wish him the best of luck in future endeavors, and wish his successor, Fred Mohrman, similar good fortune in his new position.

SENSE-OF-CONGRESS RESOLUTION TO CONTINUE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO AMTRAK

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a sense-of-the-Congress resolution that strongly urges we continue Federal assistance to Amtrak.

Rail service provides a vital link for travel and industry in Montana and other rural States across the Nation. One of my constituents said it best by describing Amtrak as a vital "lifeline" for Montana.

Ridership has steadily increased while Amtrak's dependence on Federal assistance has decreased. We must consider that 47 percent of ridership are families with incomes under \$20,000. We must consider that 36 percent are people 55 and older and 21 percent are 65 or older. Of the 500 cities and towns which Amtrak services, 161 have no air service and 52 have no bus service. Can we conceivably cut off the only form of public transportation available to the citizens whose tax dollars are supporting Amtrak?

I will not argue the need to reduce the deficit—it continues to be one of my highest priorities. But, I cannot justify elimination of our rail service. Let us keep in mind that the Federal

Government's contribution to Amtrak last year was the lowest it has been since 1977. If every Government agency or program were at its 1977 level, we would not have a deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

WASTEFUL SELECT COMMITTEE FUNDING

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body have been called upon to approve millions of dollars to extend three select committees—Aging, Children and Youth, and Narcotics.

These committees are long on good intentions but are short on legislative authority. Their efforts duplicate those of the regular, standing committees which do have legislative authority.

We should not fund committees that are not producing results. We should not fund committees that detract resources and divert effort away from the committees with the actual authority to examine these problems in the regular course of legislative business.

The wasteful nature of the select committee funding was brought home to me last week when the Select Committee on Narcotics sent Members a leather, gold embossed notebook—complete with the Member's name stamped in gold. The material contained in the notebook could have easily been assembled with a stapler. These expensive notebooks symbolize the wasteful attitude of these committees and clearly demonstrate that these committees are not fulfilling the lofty goals claimed by their proponents.

There is nothing easier than spending other people's money. It is easy to vote to spend nearly \$3 million when advocates tell us it will help children, older Americans, and help fight against drugs. But when we see tangible evidence that our money is being misspent, and when we realize that no legislative purpose is being served, we should exercise restraint. As we approach the difficult budget process, there is no better place to begin than right here with our own House committees.

AIDING THE CONTRA IS WRONG

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose aid to the Nicaraguan Contras.

Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, in her recent address to this Congress, compared the European Alliance to

the Soviet Union. She said, "Of course we are ready to fight the battle of ideas with the vigour 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."

Seeking to overthrow the Government of Nicaragua undermines this noble vision.

Can an administration which refuses to wholeheartedly support the Contradora process, honestly describe itself as a warrior in the battle of ideas?

When the President admits publicly that he seeks to oust the Nicaraguan Government, can we really claim to believe that force is not the final arbiter in human affairs?

When the President says publicly that he would ease the pressure on the Sandinistas if only they would say uncle, can we really describe ourselves as a nation that does not impose our system on others? I think not.

This House, which has voted four times in 2 years to halt this aid, understands why aiding the Contras is wrong. It violates both our international treaty obligations and our domestic laws. And it is counterproductive, pushing Nicaragua closer to the Soviet Union and farther from democracy.

There is a more compelling reason: Attempting to overthrow a sovereign government with whom we are not at war violates our sense of ourselves as an honorable Nation which can win the battle of ideas because it is right, not just because it is strong. We must not allow ourselves to be so dishonored. We must call a halt to aiding the Contras.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, April may be a crucial month for supporters of a constitutional amendment to require the Federal Government to live within its income.

To date, 32 States have passed legislation mandating a constitutional convention. Passage of the resolution in two more States will force Congress to act.

Three States—Michigan, Connecticut, and Montana are expected to take action on the convention call within the next 60 days. Backers in the States express confidence the measure will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this Congress act in a responsible manner and enact legislation that would require the Federal Government to have a balanced budget.

It is a reasonable request. Let's make the right decision now before we are

pushed into a corner and are forced to act.

□ 1300

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE BOYD TACKETT

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing last Saturday of Boyd Anderson Tackett, Sr., of Nashville, AR, who was a Member of the House of Representatives from 1949 to 1953.

Although he served only 4 years in Congress, Boyd had a long and distinguished career in public service. He was a member of the Arkansas State Legislature from 1937 to 1941, when he was elected prosecuting attorney of the Ninth Judicial Circuit of Arkansas. His law career was interrupted in 1943 by World War II, in which Boyd served in the Army Signal Corps.

Upon returning from military service, Boyd became State police commissioner from 1945 to 1948, and was then elected to the 81st and 82d Congresses. He did not seek reelection to Congress in 1952, but instead chose to run for Governor. It was the defeat in his illustrious career.

After the gubernatorial race, Boyd resumed his law practice in Texarkana, and became a noted defense attorney. He was also active in the Methodist Church and was a Mason.

Boyd's funeral was held Monday in Texarkana. I know that I join a number of Members of the House in extending our deepest sympathies to his widow, Norma; his son, Boyd Tackett, Jr., of Little Rock; his daughters, Terry Harrelson of Texarkana, and Becky Steel of Nashville, and his brother and sister in Nashville.

WHO'S RIGHT: THE ICC OR MRS. DOLE?

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, congressional committees will turn their attention to two important issues: A review of the Staggers Rail Act and the proposed sale of Conrail to the Norfolk Southern Railroad.

To address these issues adequately, however, we have to resolve a basic conflict. The question is whether or not the Norfolk Southern is revenue adequate.

Last December 17, the Interstate Commerce Commission, as part of its Staggers Act oversight responsibilities, determined that the Norfolk Southern—along with every other class I

railroad in the country—was still not revenue adequate.

On February 10—less than 2 months later—Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole formally recommended that the Norfolk Southern be allowed to purchase the Conrail system from the Federal Government because, in her view, the Norfolk Southern was a highly profitable railroad and would have no trouble covering the \$1.2 billion purchase price for Conrail.

Mr. Speaker, somebody is wrong here. Either the Norfolk Southern is "revenue inadequate" or it is "highly profitable."

Who's right—the ICC or Mrs. Dole? The Congress needs to know—and needs to know quickly.

WE CAN NO LONGER AFFORD THE SBA

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, in typical knee-jerk fashion, Washington has reacted angrily to the administration's proposal to dismantle a "sacred cow," the Small Business Administration. But what does Main Street America think?

According to a recent survey by the 500,000 member National Federation of Independent Business, 80 percent of the respondents stated that the SBA had a neutral or negative effect on their business. The SBA is overpriced and underused. It only makes sense that it should be dismantled, and its noncredit programs be transferred to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both the House and Senate Small Business Committees have acknowledged that substantial cuts need to be made in SBA lending programs. But that is not enough. The administration's proposal takes a sensible approach, and will make Federal small business programs work for those they are meant to serve.

We can no longer afford the SBA. It's time we take a good hard look at Federal small business programs and arranged them in a way that will best serve the needs of small businesses. Eliminating the failed SBA loan program will save \$3.5 billion in fiscal 1986. At the same time, retaining the SBA's noncredit programs in the Commerce Department will give the small business community a greater voice in the Federal Government. This more efficient and streamlined program can succeed. More important, it can succeed outside the framework of the SBA.

FAMILY FARMS ARE ESSENTIAL TO FUTURE OF AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had the opportunity to meet with several farmers in West Virginia. This was one of several agriculture meetings held across the State with West Virginia Agriculture Commissioner Gus R. Douglas.

The thrust of our meetings with farmers is to learn their concerns and needs as the House works on the 1985 farm bill. The meetings held so far clearly demonstrate the hardships confronting family farms not only in West Virginia, but across the Nation.

During our meetings, I have been impressed with the dedication of West Virginia farmers to preserving a way of life. They represent the strength of our Nation's agriculture industry. They are not the inefficient, poor business managers that we often hear blamed for the failures of Federal farm policy. Instead, they represent the muscle of a farm economy that will feed America and the world.

The majority of farmers in my district are young men and women, many of them with college educations. They are not lacking knowledge or desire rather they are confronted by high interest rates that drives up their cost of doing business. They are penalized by an overvalued dollar that prices their products out of the international market and they must compete with foreign farmers who receive enormous subsidies from their governments. This is unfair.

These young men and women began farming when land values were inflated. Now they watch as the value of their land rapidly declines. In addition to these factors, they must contend with bad weather and other natural elements. Less than a year ago, they were plagued with the worst drought in 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the direction of Federal farm policy we must recognize that our small farms—our family farms—are essential to the future of our agriculture industry. Incorporating their needs and concerns in the 1985 farm bill will demonstrate our support for this vital part of our communities. Moreover, it is in the best interest of the American people.

Thank you.

A HEALTHY LIFE FOR AFRICAN CHILDREN

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today in the Member's dining

room they are serving high-lysine cornbread. The high-lysine corn meal was provided compliments of Dr. Cory SerVaas of Indianapolis, president of the Benjamin Franklin Literary & Medical Society.

Kwashiorkor, a protein deficiency common in African children causes malnutrition and can be prevented by a diet of high-lysine corn. If we sent high-lysine corn to the famine victims instead of the regular corn we now send, we would be doing a greater service to the children.

This afternoon Dr. Cory SerVaas will be presenting "the Indiana plan" to the full Foreign Affairs Committee. You are all welcome to attend this hearing to hear her idea for substituting high-lysine corn for the regular corn we are now sending the African famine victims.

I urge each of you to have a piece of cornbread today and decide—should we be providing the African children just with life or with a healthy life.

THE FARM CRISIS

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there are about 300 to 400 legislators from the Midwest in Washington, DC, talking about agriculture. We met with many of them this morning. They have been trying to get a meeting with President Reagan and I guess they are too busy down there at the White House to see these legislators.

The other day, I asked the Congressional Research Service to give me an example of the President's schedule so I could analyze how busy he really is down there. I notice that while he does not have time to see these 300 State legislators to talk about the crisis in agriculture which is more severe than any time between now and the last Great Depression, he has had time to visit with the Strawberry Festival Queen and Miss America and the Turkey Federation Directors and so on.

Now, I am not opposed to any of those groups. I think they are all fine. I do think, however, that the President needs to pay some serious attention to several hundred legislators who came to town to describe one of the most severe problems agriculture has faced in several decades.

I would urge the White House folks to rethink and reconsider, and ask those legislators to come down. Let us have them visit with this President. Let us have the President describe to them why he wants to abandon farm price supports and let's have the President listen to them about why his plan would be a disaster for the Farm Belt.

MR. McINTYRE SHOULD BE SEATED

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

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, it is sad to report that after 54 days the citizens of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District still have no Representative seated in this body. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that this exercise of raw power has disenfranchised some half million American citizens.

The rectification of this congressional apartheid lies within the abilities of this body. Let us seat the only certified Representative from Indiana's Eighth District, Mr. McIntyre, pending the deliberations of the House Administration Committee.

Justice and fairness demand nothing less.

ADMINISTRATION HAS FUNDAMENTAL MISUNDERSTANDING OF "NATIONAL SECURITY"

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

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, all of us by now are aware that the national deficit must be reduced substantially. The administration contends that any cutbacks in defense spending would imperil our national security, and that the budget for fiscal year 1986 must, therefore, make great sacrifices in domestic spending.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the administration has a fundamental misunderstanding of what "national security" actually means.

The people in my Detroit district do not believe that our national security is linked solely to our ability to deter military attack. For most Americans, national security means more than just providing "for the common defense"; it includes the other Constitution-ordained objectives of our Union: to "establish Justice, insure domestic tranquility * * * promote the general welfare * * * and secure the Blessings of Liberty * * *."

Mr. Reagan's budget stands to make us a weaker people with its proposals to terminate employment assistance and student loans; to drastically decrease farm subsidies; to eliminate sorely needed urban community developments; and to cut back on nutrition, housing and health care programs.

Mr. Speaker, these needed social programs undergird our free society and allow us to avoid the most serious threats to our national security—the twin evils of ignorance and want; both of which Mr. Reagan's budget would promote. Let us confront the world not with a greater nuclear destructive possibility, but with healthy bodies

and better educated minds; our national security demands it.

□ 1310

A MAJOR PROBLEM WITH NOT SEATING RICK McINTYRE

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the well for a moment to say that it seemed to surprise some on the Democratic side that on the matter of taking a picture of the entire House there was a lack of comity on the side of the Republicans.

We keep trying to communicate again and again that in fact we on the Republican side think there is a major problem with not seating Rick McIntyre, that he has a certificate, he has won both the election and the recount, and I suspect that comity requires a two-way street, that so long as the Democratic leadership is unwilling to seat the winner who has certificated testimony from the secretary of state, it will become more and more difficult to sustain a sense of comity only on the part of those who are being mugged. There are some feelings that the muggers need to desist if in fact comity is to exist in this particular neighborhood called the House of Representatives.

LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED ON CHILD SNATCHING, ABDUCTION AND ATTEMPTED KIDNAPING

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, many of us have experienced in our own districts a rising number of kidnaping or child snatching or abduction incidents. Although in looking over the Federal laws I find them to be adequate for the crime of kidnaping, I am concerned that perhaps some loopholes might exist with the kind of attempted kidnaping that does not wind up with an actual kidnaping but does scare a family to bits and also makes police officers who are investigating these particular incidents feel handcuffed in proceeding any further.

I would ask the Members of the House if they have any horror stories or any kind of incidents in their own districts concerning child snatching or abduction or attempted kidnaping or any of those serious kinds of crimes or attempted crimes to let me know, because I intend to introduce legislation to plug the loopholes that may exist on this serious crime.

THE ISSUE OF SEATING MR. McINTYRE

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now we have been dealing with this issue of the seating of Mr. McIntyre. This morning we dealt with it again. And as I left the House Chamber earlier I heard somebody make reference to the fact that the freshman class continues to hammer away on this "rather frivolous" incident.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point that this is not frivolous. Where I come from in Texas there are a great many people who love the Constitution of this great land, and they see this and I see this as a constitutional issue of great importance, an issue of the legitimate jurisdiction of the House and the responsibility of the House.

There are people who believe in taxation only with representation. And there are 500,000 people in Indiana who are not getting their representation because of what is viewed as the irresponsible action of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of this House to come forward and to cast a responsible vote to seat this Member who is duly elected and duly certified. This is necessary not only for Mr. McIntyre—

MR. REAGAN ELECTED TO BE PRESIDENT, NOT EMPEROR

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, of all the very many reasons to be distressed at Ronald Reagan's conduct of his office, the belligerence which he has hurled at the Government of Nicaragua must be near the top of the list. Not content with the illegal covert war he has waged against a nation with whom we have full diplomatic relations, he now threatens more direct military action to overthrow their Government unless the Nicaraguans cry "Uncle."

Is this the way that American democracy is to distinguish itself from the Soviet Union and its conduct in Afghanistan?

This is to remind the President that when he swore, barely a month ago, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, he swore to abide by the constitutional provision that gives Congress the sole power to declare war. Even if Mr. Reagan has forgotten, the American people remember quite clearly that they elected him in November to be President, not emperor of the United States.

TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] raises a very, very good point on the floor this morning. The question is taxation without representation.

When this country was founded, it was founded on the idea that we should not have taxation without appropriate representation. One has to wonder if the people of Indiana would now be justified in withdrawing their taxes for that period of time that they have not been represented appropriately in the Congress. That one district has people who are being taxed daily for the operations of the Federal Government, a Federal Government in which they have no direct say at the present time. And one has to wonder whether or not it would not be an appropriate response on their behalf to suggest that without representation that they are thereby not entitled to have to pay taxes. I think one of the things we need to look at is whether or not that may be a problem for us in the future, one that would probably have to be resolved in the courts.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUSTAMANTE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on both motions to suspend the rules.

□ 1320

AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1985

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1096) to authorize appropriations for famine relief and recovery in Africa.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1096

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

Chapter 9 of Part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292-2292p) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 495K. AFRICAN FAMINE ASSISTANCE.

"(a) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to provide assistance

for famine relief, rehabilitation, and recovery in Africa. Assistance under this section shall be provided for humanitarian purposes and shall be provided on a grant basis. Such assistance shall include—

"(1) relief, rehabilitation, and recovery projects to benefit the poorest people, including the furnishing of seeds for planting, fertilizer, pesticides, farm implements, farm animals and vaccine and veterinary services to protect livestock upon which people depend, blankets, clothing, and shelter, disease prevention and health care projects, water projects (including water purification and well-drilling), small-scale agricultural projects, and food protection and preservation projects; and

"(2) projects to meet emergency health needs, including vaccinations.

"(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

"(1) USE OF PVO'S FOR REHABILITATION AND RECOVERY PROJECTS.—Not less than 80 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to this section which is used for rehabilitation and recovery projects pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be used for grants to private and voluntary organizations and international organizations.

"(2) EMERGENCY HEALTH PROJECTS.—Not less than 18 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for emergency health projects pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

"(3) MANAGEMENT SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to this section, \$2,500,000 shall be transferred to the 'Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development' account and used for management support activities associated with the planning, monitoring, and supervision of emergency food assistance for Africa.

"(c) Authorization of Appropriations.—In addition to the amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated \$137,500,000 for the fiscal year 1985 for use in providing assistance under this section.

"(d) POLICIES AND AUTHORITIES TO BE APPLIED.—Assistance under this section shall be furnished in accordance with the policies and general authorities contained in section 491."

SEC. 3. MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for "Migration and Refugee Assistance" for the fiscal year 1985, \$37,500,000 for assisting refugees and displaced persons in Africa.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) PROJECTS FOR IMMEDIATE DEVELOPMENT NEEDS.—Not less than 54 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to this section shall be made available to the United Nations Development Program Trust Fund for ICARA II for projects such as those proposed at the second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II) to address the immediate development needs created by refugees and displaced persons in Africa.

(2) EMERGENCY RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS.—The remaining amount appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used by the Bureau for Refugee Programs of the Department of State for emergency relief and recovery efforts in Africa.

SEC. 4. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) COUNTRIES TO BE ASSISTED.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available only for assistance in those countries in Africa which have suffered during

calendar years 1984 and 1985 from exceptional food supply problems due to drought and other calamities.

(b) NONAPPLICABILITY OF PROVISION.—Assistance may be provided with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act without regard to section 620(e)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370(e)(1)).

(c) ENSURING THAT ASSISTANCE REACHES INTENDED RECIPIENTS.—The President shall ensure that adequate procedures have been established so that assistance pursuant to this Act is provided to the famine victims for whom it is intended.

(d) UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO MEET EMERGENCY NEEDS.—

(1) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS.—Not later than June 30, 1985, the President shall report to the Congress—

(A) the emergency needs, including food needs, for African famine assistance that are identified by the President's Interagency Task Force on the African Food Emergency, private voluntary and organizations active in famine relief, the United Nations Office for Emergency Operations in Africa, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the World Food Program, and such other organizations as the President considers appropriate; and

(B) the projected fiscal year 1985 contribution by the United States Government to meet an appropriate share of those needs referred to in subparagraph (A).

(2) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING.—

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should submit a request for supplemental funding for emergency African famine assistance if available funding is insufficient to meet the projected contribution determined under paragraph (1)(B).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

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

Mr. Speaker, we are now all aware that there is a tremendous crisis facing the African Continent. It is a crisis of famine, of starvation, of severe malnutrition of thousands of refugees fleeing drought and other calamities, and a crisis of widespread diseases compounded by an absence of sufficient medicines and health services.

This is not just an African crisis, it is a human crisis encompassing us all. We cannot and will not sit by and watch millions of our fellow human beings die from starvation and thousands more suffer from the general devastation brought on by this massive calamity.

More than 7 million people in Africa are threatened with imminent starvation. Another 30 million are severely malnourished and are immediately at risk. A total of 150 million people in over 20 African countries are facing grave famine conditions. This drought

is threatening the widest area in Africa in recent history. In the two countries of Ethiopia and Mozambique alone, more than 400,000 people have died over the past 2 years. Hundreds continue to die daily throughout the drought-affected countries.

This crisis involves much more than a shortage of food. Diseases are spreading; malnutrition among children and nursing mothers is incredibly high. Livestock herds, upon which large communities depend for their very survival, are being decimated. Water levels for irrigation and human consumption have either dropped or dried up altogether. There are no seeds to plant for the next harvest. Basic medicines are simply not available in many countries. Basic hand farm implements are in short supply threatening prospects for the next crop even if the rains do come.

It needs to be emphasized that effective assistance in this crisis will require much more than just the shipments of food if the people in these countries are to survive, and then to begin the immediate process of recovery and rehabilitation.

The African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985, which is now before this body, represents a critically needed effort to begin addressing these serious nonfood needs. H.R. 1096 would authorize \$175 million in fiscal 1985 including \$137.5 million for relief, rehabilitation, and recovery purposes, and \$37.5 million for assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Africa.

The bill would require that of the \$137.5 million authorized for rehabilitation and recovery projects at least 80 percent be used for grants to private and voluntary organizations and international organizations; at least 18 percent be used for emergency health projects; and \$2.5 million be used for operating expenses monitoring the distribution of emergency food aid.

The bill would require that of the \$37.5 million authorized for refugee assistance, at least 54 percent would be for the United Nations Development Program Trust Fund [UNDP] for the second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa [ICARA II] for projects such as those proposed at that conference to meet immediate development needs, and the remaining amount would be used by the Department of State's Bureau for Refugee Programs for emergency relief and recovery efforts.

General provisions of the bill include a limitation of assistance to those countries which have suffered from exceptional food supply problems in 1984 and 1985 due to drought and other calamities; a waiver of the so-called Hickenlooper amendment prohibiting aid to countries which have expropriated U.S. property without adequate compensation; a provision for assurance that aid is reaching

the famine victims for whom it is intended; and a reporting requirement under which the President is requested to ask Congress for further supplemental disaster assistance funding for fiscal 1985 if needed to meet an appropriate U.S. share of the aid required for African famine relief.

This bill will authorize only nonfood aid to the disaster-struck countries of Africa. Appropriations for food aid under Public Law 480 are contained in H.R. 1239, to be considered on the House floor on Thursday. The supplemental food aid funding for fiscal 1985 will not require an additional separate authorization because one already exists under Public Law 480 law.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we should be proud of our national reaction to this human catastrophe unfolding in Africa. We should also be proud of the administration's commendable efforts since October of last year to increase the American response to these drastic needs in Africa. We must continue to provide this level of assistance.

Finally, we should note with satisfaction the extremely swift manner in which the House of Representatives has acted on this urgent legislation. The expeditious treatment of this bill would not have been possible without the tremendous bipartisan cooperation in developing and moving through the responsible committees this important and reasoned approach to the African famine.

This legislation enjoys total bipartisan support and sponsorship. I want to pay particular tribute to Congresswoman ROUKEMA, the ranking Republican member on the Select Committee on Hunger; Congressman CONTE, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee; Congressman LELAND, the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger; and Congressman TED WEISS of New York, the initiator of this bipartisan effort, for the collective leadership they have provided to move this critical legislation so quickly to the House floor, we are all in their debt.

I would also like to make specific acknowledgement of the key contributions made during this process by Congressmen FASCELL and BROOMFIELD of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and by Congressman WHITTEN, Congressman OBEY, Congresswoman SMITH and Congressman KEMP on the Appropriations Committee.

There are so many other Members who also deserve recognition for their critical work on this issue, and I apologize for not mentioning them here as time does not permit a complete listing, but their contributions have not gone unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1096, the Africa

Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985, and urge its prompt passage by the House so that we can get the bill enacted into law as soon as possible.

H.R. 1096 is a disaster assistance measure addressing one of the great tragedies of our time: the starvation which today faces millions of men, women, and children in sub-Saharan Africa.

The United States and other donors have acted generously so far in this catastrophe, but much remains to be done. We must keep the pipeline of emergency humanitarian aid open, or else people will die who could have been saved. The Agency for International Development is just about out of funds for the relief effort. That is why it is essential to send legislation to the President for signature quickly.

The bill authorizes \$175 million in nonfood aid which is necessary for disaster assistance along with the food aid which will be funded in separate legislation. A total of \$37.5 million in the bill is authorized for refugees and displaced persons who have been forced by calamity to flee their homes.

As the report on this bill correctly notes, food aid is essential but that alone is not enough. The nonfood disaster assistance authorized under this legislation is needed for a wide range of urgent relief for the famine sufferers, including transportation to bring in the relief supplies; provision of health care, medicines and vaccines; blankets, clothing and tents; food protection; seeds for the next harvest; and other assistance needed to prevent death and support rehabilitation and recovery. A variety of such items, such as seeds, health care, food protection, and many other items, are also eligible for rehabilitation and recovery efforts authorized under this bill. Citations are included in the section 495K(a)(1) of the bill.

A separate appropriations measure providing for supplemental Public Law 480 food aid and for disaster assistance authorized by H.R. 1096 is scheduled to come before the House later this week. I intend to support that measure also.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we will be needing to focus also on the longer term needs for development of these impoverished African countries so that the danger of famines will decrease in the future. The Foreign Affairs Committee is reviewing Africa's longer term needs. We will be presenting to the House in our fiscal year 1986-87 foreign assistance legislation further provisions for Africa which I hope will enlist your support.

In conclusion, I want to thank the distinguished sponsors of different emergency Africa relief measures for making this bill possible. I particularly wish to commend Mr. WEISS, who introduced H.R. 1096; Mr. WOLFE, who

has so ably managed the bill; Mr. BROOMFIELD, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee; Mr. CONTE, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee; Mr. LELAND, the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger; and Mrs. ROUKEMA, the ranking minority member of the select committee. It was their dedication and hard work, in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation, which produced the measure before us today. I urge its immediate passage. ●

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, although I am a cosponsor of this compromise legislation, I have serious reservations about the levels of assistance it authorizes.

The amount of aid authorized in this bill for assistance to Africa far exceeds the authorization levels requested by the administration. While Congress is facing the complex problem of reducing our deficit, we must be careful about authorizing increases that exceed the President's budget.

While emergency food aid is needed for Africa in 1985, this is not the long-term solution to the food problems on that continent. We must help them help themselves.

Unfortunately, the Ethiopian Government has collectivized agriculture according to the Soviet model, and produced the same dismal result. Colonel Mengistu ignored early warnings for 2 years that his farm policy could contribute to famine. Yet, his regime now plans to extend collectivization so that, by 1990, more than half of its people will work on collectivized farms. Our country will then be asked to give more help.

We must also call upon our allies around the world to do more in this area. While America has been blessed with wealth and abundance, other countries must also share the burden of assisting the struggling countries of Africa. Although the Soviet Union volunteered to assist in the distribution of food in Ethiopia, one of its closest allies in Africa, it was the United States that provided the greatest amount of food and financial assistance for famine relief. While the Soviets have given Ethiopia millions of dollars in arms, they have done little to relieve the famine in that country.

While I will not oppose this legislation, I call upon my colleagues to reexamine future authorizations of this nature. Let us not go overboard. Let us also work with the governments in Africa to use the private sector to help them promote long-term solutions to their food crisis.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement on the problems in Ethiopia. There was an article or, I should say, an editorial in the Wall Street Journal recently that goes into that in some depth, and I would ask unanimous consent that that editorial be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

DEATH IN ASOSA

The story behind the Ethiopian famine is beginning to reach the West, as in the report nearby from the Economist's Wayne Svoboda. But the regime is creating a lesser known second horror in the resettlement program it claims as a solution. Another "final solution" is more likely.

Ethiopia has tried to disguise this crime, duping some foreign visitors (including, from all indications, the famed Mother Teresa of Calcutta), but detailed reports reaching this page suggest that the situation is appalling. One source is Gayle Smith, an American free-lance journalist, who has interviewed, in their own language, refugees escaping to the Sudan from the Asosa resettlement camp in southwestern Wollega province.

At Asosa, say the refugees, 4,000 sick people died from late November to late December alone. At first they were allowed to bury the bodies, but then they were made to pile them outside the camps. One refugee reported seeing a heap of 168 dead bodies in mid-December.

Conditions were so bad, with little food, no medicine and makeshift shelter, that the camp dwellers constantly tried to escape and make their way to the border more than 60 miles away, even though government soldiers have killed hundreds of escapees and warned that relatives left behind would be executed.

The refugees are all from the northern Ethiopian province of Tigre, which is in open revolt against the Russian-backed military/communist central government. A number of sources state that the government has been forcibly seizing Tigreans, even from other regions, for its "resettlement program." The International Committee of the Red Cross reported two weeks ago that 200 victims had been taken at gunpoint from one of its feeding centers in Mekelle, the government-held capital of Tigre. As a result, the ICRC suspended its Mekelle feeding program.

Western diplomats have long been skeptical of the resettlement that the Ethiopian regime hopes to extend to 1.5 million Tigreans. Addis Ababa claims that it has to transfer people from eroded northern deserts to still fertile highlands. Yet farms in the drought region have been made productive in demonstrations by the Relief Society of Tigre, the efficient aid group for the rebel province, at one-third the cost of one family's "resettlement."

Even if the regime were sincere about its true aims, it completely lacks the resources to create a new agricultural province in the south. The Tigreans themselves fear the worst. They think Halle Mariam Mengistu wants to wipe them out, and indeed it would

not be the first time genocide has been disguised as resettlement. The West has never believed accounts of holocaust until well after the fact, but we've seen enough of Mr. Mengistu and his Soviet advisers to suspect something truly ghastly.

The regime has deliberately denied food to the rebel areas, even though Tigreans and Eritreans have called repeatedly for a food truce to allow in unarmed relief convoys. United Nations official Kurt Jansson tried to broach the idea in a recent meeting with the Ethiopians but Mr. Mengistu cut him short, saying in effect that aid would go only where his army could take it. Now the Addis Ababa regime has threatened to bomb the backdoor relief reaching rebel areas from the Sudan. Is it likely Mr. Mengistu cares how many die in Asosa?

The possibility of an Ethiopian holocaust can't be denied. Worse, it will be furthered if the West persists in fooling itself about the real nature of the Mengistu famine.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], the initiator of this legislation.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who serve on the Africa Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and numerous other Members of this body who have occasion in the course of the past year and a half to visit the African Continent and to witness in person the suffering and the dying that is destroying hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of human beings, know that the effort that we are undertaking today is well-warranted and absolutely essential in order to prevent the loss of additional lives.

In January of this year, we had occasion, with the Subcommittee on Africa, to visit Mozambique. We witnessed the consequences of the famine; we saw that people were walking around in barely sufficient clothing, many of them in rags and many nude. There were absolutely no medical supplies left in that country, and there were no consumer goods of any kind.

What the legislation that is before us tries to do for African countries affected by the famine is to provide assistance beyond the food itself in the form of medicine, blankets, seeds and other necessary items so that there can be preparation for the next harvest. This includes minimal shelter, storage, well drilling facilities, and similar relief and refugee help. It is clear that the American people have led the way in this effort. Their outpouring of support after they witnessed on their television screens at home what is happening in Africa, has been nothing short of magnificent.

□ 1330

The various relief agencies estimate that during the last 3 months of 1984 and January 1985, some \$60 million had been contributed by individual Americans, and that by April in excess of \$100 million will have been contributed. That is an unparalleled achieve-

ment. So what we are doing in the Congress and in this House now is following the lead that has been set by the American people.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], deserves a tremendous amount of credit for his leadership role over the years, in trying to get both congressional and administration attention focused on this problem. I will not repeat the names of all those to whom he has given credit for achieving the early consideration and adoption of this legislation on a bipartisan basis. Suffice it to say that this effort is also moving forward in the other body with a spirit of bipartisan cooperation, and it bodes well for the early enactment of this legislation.

Before closing, I want to give credit also to those Democratic and Republican staff who worked together so effectively behind the scenes for the achievement of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] has expired.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention specifically the staff of the Subcommittee on Africa, Dr. Ann Holloway, Steve Weissman, and Salih Booker; the staff of the Select Committee on Hunger, Mary Ruth Herbers and Doug Coots; the staff person of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], Robert Goudie; the staff of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Lew Gulick and Steve Nelson; and my own staff person, Patricia Fleming. Their work over these past couple of months has been absolutely indispensable to the legislation having reached this stage, and I want to express my appreciation to them as well as to the members mentioned by Chairman WOLPE.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who has been working on this subject for more than 3 years, even before it became fashionable.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] for his leadership on this measure, and I commend also our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for bringing this measure to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my support to this important piece of legislation before this House today. H.R. 1096, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985, represents a bipartisan compromise crafted over the course of these past months, which

will result in alleviating some of the terrible suffering taking place in over 20 African countries that are experiencing food shortages resulting from 3 years of drought.

There is widespread death from starvation in Ethiopia, Sudan, Chad, Mali, and Mozambique. Severe hunger has also been reported in Niger, Kenya, and Mauritania. The total food deficit of the 20 drought-affected African countries for the 1984-85 crop year is estimated by the United Nations at 6.8 million metric tons of cereal grain.

Mr. Speaker, the precise number of people in Africa suffering from drought is not known, but estimates from international relief agencies, private voluntary agencies and U.S. Government sources indicate that as many as 150 million people are now affected.

In Ethiopia alone 2.5 million people are in life-threatening situations. The outlook for food supplies in Africa has deteriorated further following a poor 1984 harvest in a number of countries in southern and eastern Africa and with most of the Sahelian countries just completing the harvesting of seriously drought-reduced crops.

H.R. 1096 is urgently needed, as experts predict that the worst may be yet to come. The drought is spreading, not only in Ethiopia but 24 African countries in all are now confronting that circle of hell known as famine.

Ethiopia, the first to succumb on a massive scale, has been reduced to a wasteland. In early December it was estimated that at least 1.2 million tons of food will be needed to stave off a virtual annihilation of that nation between now and the next possible harvest, in December 1985.

As Ethiopia cries out in agony, the shadow of death from hunger falls across Africa:

In Mozambique, it is estimated that at least 100,000 people died in 1983 from hunger-related causes. The Government has a minimal stock of 1,300 tons of grain when the need is estimated at 3,450.

In Burkina Faso (formerly Upper Volta), which has the highest reported infant mortality rate in the world, the northern provinces have been the hardest hit. In Dori, crop losses are expected to exceed 95 percent for the second straight year.

In Cameroon, severe water shortages are plaguing both human beings and livestock. Refugees from Chad, pouring over the border in search of food, are further stretching 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. And they continue to cross the Ethiopian border, attempting to escape the desperate conditions of that country.

Traditional appeals to alleviate hunger have emphasized the long-recognized moral and humanitarian re-

sponsibility that our Nation has to the hungry and impoverished.

However, less attention has been focused on the fact that in an increasingly interdependent world, our national security and the security of the international community are linked directly to a resolution of the world hunger problem.

The deprivation experienced by the world's poor and hungry and those among them who can harness the anger and indignation borne of being without the means to purchase or produce enough food, points to an explosive instability which many fear will intensify during the coming decades.

Through the press and the media we are constantly bombarded with the facts of death—in wrecks, in riots, in robberies, in natural disaster—and while we flinch and groan at the daily spectacle of carnage and suffering, we simply cannot comprehend what it means when we are told that this year 15 million children in our world will die of malnutrition and related diseases.

If we were told that someone had invented a nuclear weapon that selectively slaughtered only children under the age of 5, and that one such Hiroshima-size weapon would be detonated somewhere in the world every 3 days, every week, every year, year after year—and that's what would be required to reach that annual total of 15 million—I think it's fair to say that the people of our Nation, and every nation on Earth, would be aroused to demand that something be done to stop the slaughter.

We must not continue to be blind to the fact that when more than 42,000 children under the age of 5 die each day from hunger and malnutrition, approximately 100,000 children go blind each year because of vitamin A deficiencies and in some poorer countries, as many as 40 percent of the children die each year before the age of 5 mostly from nutrition related causes, it does not happen in a vacuum.

The African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985 is a step in the right direction. But let's not forget how these problems are tied to other crisis our Nation is facing and the importance of accepting and understanding the independent relationship the United States has with the devastation facing many lesser developed countries.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1096.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I wish to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from New York who has just spoken and who has been one of the most consistently effective advocates on behalf of the cause of world hunger for many, many years. As the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] noted earlier, his contributions should in fact be recognized by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful that we are able to come together today and continue the U.S. commitment to helping the drought-stricken countries of Africa. It is a tribute to this Congress that we have made this a priority early in the session.

I hope we can continue to make Africa a priority because no matter how much food aid we send today, without a commitment to long-term strategies, Africans will still be starving next year. Without seed and well-drilling equipment, there will be no grain and vegetables next year. During the budget process, I urge each of you to remember that seeds and tools sent today mean fewer bags of grain that we'll need to send next year.

In July, the U.N. Decade for Women World Conference will take place in Nairobi, Kenya. Its outcome may be the key to any long-term solution to drought and famine. It will provide a forum for women in developing nations to tell us what we can do to help them solve their own problems. They don't want or need us to do it for them, but they do know that we can offer valuable assistance and tools if we will only hear what they need. Women perform nearly two-thirds of the world's work hours. Let's listen to them as we consider the long-term strategies we must consider to continue the commitment we are showing here today.

By listening to women in developing countries, we will be tapping new resources in Africa, resources that will enrich it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the debate, I would like to take a moment to put things into their proper perspective.

The ongoing commitment by our Government, and by our people as well, to helping Africa in its need for food and agricultural stability is truly remarkable and is a vivid reminder of America's role as the preeminent champion of peace in the world.

I get more than a little upset when I hear suggestions made in some of our debates around here that the United States is the arms merchant of the world and that, somehow, the interest and desire for peace that has motivated our country's foreign policies over the years is open to question.

It is sometimes said that the United States pays insufficient attention to Africa and the problems there. But let us look at the record. In fiscal year

1983, we provided about 750,000 metric tons of food to sub-Saharan Africa through emergency humanitarian donations and our regular food assistance programs under Public Law 480. In fiscal year 1984, we provided about 1.1 million metric tons of food to sub-Saharan Africa. And now, in fiscal 1985, the projections point to a total American contribution of 2.5 million metric tons of food toward meeting sub-Saharan Africa's needs.

Now let's contrast our record with that of the Soviet Union. Over the last 2 years, the Soviet bloc has provided less than 20,000 metric tons of food to all of sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, the Soviet bloc has entered into a series of treaty arrangements with certain African countries that have had the net result of allowing the Soviets to plunder African fishing waters.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD an article that appeared in the February 7, 1985, edition of *Newsday*, which reports the astonishing fact that in 1983 alone the Soviet bloc caught nearly 1 million metric tons of fish in waters off the west coast of Africa. Entitled "Soviets Take Food Off Africa's Table," the article goes on to describe the efforts our Government is making in helping African countries regain control over their own fisheries. The text of the article is as follows:

SOVIETS TAKE FOOD OFF AFRICA'S TABLE

(By Daniel S. Mariaschin)

The waters off West Africa contain some of the world's richest fishing grounds: Ample harvests of sardines, herring, hake, squid and shrimp are recorded annually. On a continent that is ravaged by periodic famine, fish is a vital food source. In the West African region, consumption of fish provides upwards of 50 percent of daily protein requirements.

There are a few indigenous fishing fleets in the area, notably those from Morocco, the Ivory Coast and Senegal, but most West African fishing is artisanal—done by individual fishermen utilizing small launches or canoes relatively close to shore. The major catches are going to foreign fleets, with their sophisticated trawlers and research vessels able to find the stocks and capable in many instances of processing the fish on board. Since most countries now claim exclusive rights to waters as far as 200 miles from shore, foreign nations have concluded fishing agreements with host countries who invariably receive little in return for the rights to their valuable resource.

The USSR and the eastern bloc nations have been among the principal abusers of fishing privileges. According to recently published statistics, the foreign catch off West Africa has amounted to nearly 60 percent of the total harvest. The acknowledged catch of the Soviets and their client states for 1983 (the unreported figures are believed by western fisheries experts to be much higher) amounted to nearly one million metric tons. A number of other foreign fleets, the largest of which are from Japan, Spain and South Korea, also engage in fishing off West Africa.

In exchange for the right to fish these waters, the Soviets have entered into a

number of bilateral agreements over the past decade with a group of West African countries including Angola, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Gambia, Mauritania and Sierra Leone. On the surface of the agreement, which vary somewhat from country to country, look like a good deal for the host nations: the sharing of stock assessments and other data, the establishment of fisheries management and maritime training schools as well as a portion of the catch, sometimes amounting to 10 percent to 12 percent of the total.

A closer look reveals these fisheries pacts are decidedly in the USSR's favor. Moscow has not developed an interest in the West African coastal region only for its value as a food source. It has been able to obtain port and anchorage rights, supply arrangements, the right to fly in fresh crews and the permanent stationing of "fishing ministry representatives" in host ports. Along with the well-known intelligence gathering activities of the Russian trawlers, each of these benefits gives the USSR a potential military advantage in the strategic central-eastern Atlantic region. Though the basic purpose of the Soviet fleet is to fish, that would not preclude its taking on additional assignments, including the testing of currents and gathering data for Russian submarines plying the Atlantic.

U.S. experts in marine fisheries and African affairs believe some West African governments are beginning to realize their arrangements with Moscow are a one-way affair. In some cases, promises to construct processing and research facilities have not been kept. In Mauritania, the research facility was built but part of it is off limits to all but Soviet personnel.

A fuller appreciation of the fisheries' value has led some West African officials to look more closely at foreign fleets, particularly the USSR's with its factory ships. There is serious concern that overfishing will lead to an irreversible alteration of the biological balance in West African waters. Even artisanal fishermen are beginning to voice complaints about the Soviet and eastern bloc catch, which has begun to have an impact on local economies.

In response to growing dissatisfaction with the USSR and what is seen as its increasing exploitation of one of West Africa's few abundant natural resources, several federal department and agencies including the Pentagon, Department of State, the Agency for International Development, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Coast Guard, are proposing two programs to assist host countries in managing and protecting their maritime fisheries.

The Pentagon's West African Coastal Surveillance Initiative would provide U.S. Coast Guard training to West African navies and coastal patrols. The objective is to improve their capability to monitor the fishing activities of foreign fleets in their economic zones.

While rights to on-board inspection and surveillance are claimed by all West African countries, in practice this activity is spotty and ineffective. Coast Guard training in surveillance methods and in halting violations can help re-establish an equilibrium in host nation-foreign fleet relations.

A companion initiative, to improve West African fisheries management and development, will be undertaken by AID. A program of high-level seminars and training sessions in such areas as data collection, stock assessments and monitoring, and the establishment of effective policies and regu-

lations would contribute to a professionalization of host nation fisheries. Advice on increasing the local harvest, how to limit spoilage in the artisanal market, assessing changes in the biological balance and trade and marketing ought enable the West Africans to better control and benefit from their own fish stocks.

Noel C. Koch, principal deputy assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs, is very optimistic about the potential of the proposals: "We're not feeding people, we're teaching people how to feed themselves. This is a capacity-building effort." He said that "if we can get the fish inland, we can begin to attack the nutrition problem."

The initial investment for the two initiatives is in the bare-bones category—about \$4.5 million for the first year. Individuals involved in the program are confident that this modest start can begin a process of winning back friends in a region where the USSR has made important inroads—but has also engaged in bullying—in recent years. The proposals don't involve massive industrial projects or weapons deals, but do speak directly to the questions of economic independence and a bolstering of national pride, much needed commodities in the developing world.

The Pentagon has requested \$2 million for the surveillance project, but the AID management initiative, which originally was to receive \$2.5 million has been pared back to \$1 million. Any further cutbacks would render that project ineffective.

For the West Africans, tightening fisheries management and surveillance should over the long term increase exports and foreign exchange, add to local employment, contribute significantly to local food supplies, improve nutrition and correct the biological imbalances that result from overfishing by foreign fleets. In turn, this ought to promote internal political stability which serves not only West Africa, but western interest as well.

Here at home, we take fish for granted. In West Africa, fisheries are literally an economic lifeline on which people's survival depends. Policymakers in Washington have proposed two plans that make eminent strategic and humanitarian sense. They deserve the support of the Congress and of those who feel that West Africa's food supply should not depend on the good graces of foreign, particularly eastern bloc, fishing fleets.

Mr. Speaker, Africa's problem has become the world's problem. The sad fact is that the present food crisis is not going to be solved anytime soon. And I want to take this opportunity to again declare my support for a meeting of donor countries to develop a coordinated and concerted strategy for dealing with this problem.

And, in conclusion, I also renew my call for our Government to place the crisis in Ethiopia on the agenda of United States-Soviet discussions. If the Soviet Union is as truly interested in peace as their propaganda so loudly proclaims, they can demonstrate that interest by bringing peace to one of the very countries in their own empire: By offering humanitarian aid, instead of foisting billions of dollars worth of arms on a bankrupt country; by offering trucks and planes to speed

food to people in need, instead of using such equipment to forcibly uproot people and move them around the country; and, finally, to offer a hand of respect and friendship to those suffering people of Ethiopia, instead of subjugating them under the heel of a tyrant like Colonel Mengistu.

□ 1340

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say before introducing the next speaker that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has served this past term as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Africa and I just want to express publicly my appreciation for his assistance in moving a number of bipartisan initiatives through our committee, both in the last term and more immediately as we are dealing with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, which has played an absolutely critical role in moving this legislation.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I would like to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Foreign Affairs Committee for his great leadership. It was he who invited me to Ethiopia in 1983 where he led a delegation to one of the most critical situations I have ever seen in my lifetime. When we returned, we tried, through his leadership, to get more funds for emergency aid. Some supported us, Mr. Speaker, but few really listened. We in Congress were not willing to act until television brought into our living rooms and dens the horror of starvation in Ethiopia. Now we are trying to rectify our slowness in responding. We are finally reacting to the cry of the people in Africa, but it is still not enough.

I think this bill represents the kind of compromise needed to provide the kind of support needed not only in Ethiopia, but in other parts of Africa. Over 150 million people are at risk of starvation today in Africa. They need our help. This legislation will not solve all the problems, but goes a long way to ameliorate the short-term problem of famine.

We hope to come back to this House and ask the Congress to do more for those suffering so badly on the continent of Africa.

Again, I am very pleased at the leadership provided by my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE]; also the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS]. I would like to thank also the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKE-MAN], who serves as the ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Hunger.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, I headed a delegation,

sponsored by the Speaker of the House, to Ethiopia. We saw incredible human misery, people literally dying before our eyes. With the help of Congress we have been able to assist in saving some of those lives, and now we can do more.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will have no problem in passing this compromise measure. I know that the Members of this body support our continued involvement in alleviating hunger and suffering in Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, recently, Congressman SCHEUER and I were in Rome and had an opportunity to talk to the World Food Program people. They brought out some startling facts. I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] will talk to us about those in a few minutes; but one of the things that startled me was that the population of the sub-Sahara is growing at a rate of about 3 percent a year, while their food production is growing at about 1 percent a year, which means that the problems they face today are astronomical, but the ones they are going to face in the future are even more horrible.

There has to be a direct correlation between food production and population growth in that continent. If not, the starvation that we see today will be nothing compared to what we are going to see in the future.

It is very important that education along with this food be sent to Africa to make sure those people know how important it is that their food production be increased, as well as their population controlled, because the United States of America and the free world cannot continue to feed these people throughout the rest of this century and the next century. Our resources are limited. We want to help all that we can, but with that population growth, it will be impossible unless they get that under control.

One other thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that Ethiopia receives approximately half the food aid that has been going to Africa and that country has not been doing with that food what they should. They have been diverting their food resources, the ones that we have been giving to them, away from lands that they do not control to lands that they do control, so in effect, the United States of America has been in part responsible for subsidizing and supporting a Communist dictatorship over there. We cannot do much about that, but we should be putting pressure on them to spend these resources in the way that we want them to be spent, to give food to all the starving people of Ethiopia

and not just in the areas that they control.

I would like to point out a few things they have been spending their money on in Ethiopia, instead of feeding the starving people in their land. They spent \$22½ million to host the Organization of African Unity in June 1983.

They spent \$2½ million for Mercedes Benz cars and \$2½ million to build a villa for Mu'ammar Qadhafi. The money should not be spent for that. It should be spent for the people that they pretend to protect.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DAN BURTON, for his outstandingly fine remarks. He really hit the nail on the head. If we cannot do more than give constant, repetitive, predictable emergency programs and emergency food aid to the Africans, we are going to be calling upon American taxpayers to do this until the memory of man runneth not.

Would it not be kinder to all taxpayers and infinitely kinder to the starving people of Africa if we put together a comprehensive development program that would help them increase the production of food and perhaps decrease the production of new human mouths to feed? That is their problem. As Congressman BURTON indicated, they have over a 3-percent population growth, about a 1-percent increase in food production, so they have a 2-percent decrease per capita in the availability of food. That is a pitiful, tragic fact of life, that we have to help them find some fundamental cures for.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the humanitarian bill before us today which would provide badly needed famine relief to an estimated 20 million Africans who face starvation and death.

Going beyond this emergency, Mr. Speaker, we, in Congress, have a responsibility to look beyond the short-term, quick-fix approach to this continuing and tragic scenario. We must develop a long-range plan that attacks the cause of the illness, rather than just treat the symptoms. We must help the nations of sub-Saharan Africa achieve the food self-sufficiency that is within their grasp—if only they will it, and if only we stay the course with the other donor countries.

Although it is easy to attribute the current crisis in Africa to the region's lack of rain over the last 3 years and the ensuing drought and reduced food production, the fact of the matter is that food production in sub-Saharan Africa has declined on a per capita basis by 20 percent in the last 15 years. Even though food production is going up gradually, population in the region has grown by a stunning 45 percent over this period. That's the highest

population growth rate in the world, over 3 percent per annum for the Africa south of the Sahara.

Unless we take steps to provide the African farmers with appropriate technology and training which will help them increase food production, and unless we help these nations get their explosive rates of population increase under some kind of rational control, I fear we will never see the day when Africa will be able to feed itself. We will sentence millions of sub-Saharan Africans to the constant specter of starvation and death.

A long-term program to solve Africa's food production problems would be a far more intelligent use of American taxpayers' dollars, and a far more caring and compassionate approach to the human misery and suffering that is now endemic to the region.

Without a major effort to promote a balanced program of development aimed at generally improving the status of women in Africa, estimates show that the population of sub-Saharan Africa, currently at 434 million, will virtually double in about two decades.

Such an effort to provide women with equal access to the world of education, work, and credit is already happening at a rapid pace in Latin America and Asia, but has yet to begin in Africa. When faced with opportunities and challenges, women quickly change their goals concerning family size.

Most African farmers manage small subsistence farms. Unless an effort is made to provide these farmers with low-resource technology that they can apply effectively to raising food, we cannot expect to see the increase in food production needed to help the region attain food self-sufficiency.

It will be difficult to develop an appropriate program to provide African farmers with the necessary tools and expertise to increase food production. What has worked in the past in India and other parts of Asia has produced disappointing results in the very parts of Africa that are faced with famine today.

The "Green Revolution," which dramatically raised food production in other developing regions, has to date bypassed sub-Saharan Africa. Because of the region's political instability, the almost total absence of government infrastructure, its low and erratic rainfall, its short growing seasons, its continuing soil degradation and deforestation due to human activities, and too few skilled people, experience shows that increasing agricultural productivity is more difficult in sub-Saharan Africa than in most developing regions.

For these reasons and others much of our Nation's capital and energy-intensive "high tech" agricultural technology, involving complex and expensive machinery and great inputs of ir-

rigation and fertilizer, is just not applicable in rural Africa for the low-resource, small-scale farmers who account for the vast preponderance of agricultural production.

In terms of reducing population growth, long-held traditions must be refashioned. African women must be educated and shown that appropriate technology can take the place of additional children in handling the farming chores. At the same time, they must be taught that improved health care and nutrition will reduce the infant mortality rate and assure that their children will survive to maturity so that they can care for them in their old age.

I recently led a delegation, which included Mr. ROE of New Jersey, Mr. LUJAN of New Mexico, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana, to Israel to assess Israeli agricultural technology aimed at developing arid lands. We also traveled to Rome and met with officials of the U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization to discuss the most effective methods to end the constant, repetitive waves of famine which have swept over sub-Saharan Africa over past decades.

The Israelis have made great strides in developing agricultural techniques for desert farming. Our delegation believes many of those techniques could be adapted to the needs of small African farms—technologies that would be consistent with traditional African agricultural methods, reflect local conditions, be affordable, utilizing locally produced and repairable equipment and machinery, and involving low risks and minimal capital.

As the Congress looks to long-term solutions to the African agricultural problems, we would be wise to consider joining United States-Israeli research and development programs to study advances in Israeli technology as it pertains to agriculture in arid zones with an eye toward adapting it to Africa's unique environment.

During our meetings with U.N. officials, including FAO Director General Edouard Saouma and our splendid Ambassador to FAO, our former distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Millicent Fenwick, we were encouraged to learn that the FAO recognizes the direct link between exploding rates of population growth and the severe food shortages in Africa. FAO officials also realize that the introduction of appropriate agricultural technology can be used as a natural starting point to convince African women that such farming aids can be adequate substitutes for additional children.

The FAO will play an important role in integrating population growth reduction programs with increased availability of appropriate agricultural technology on the African Continent,

thanks to its ability to coordinate its programs with other pertinent agencies such as the UNFPA and the WHO. In addition, FAO is expected to issue in the near future a position paper which will detail its prospective plans for dealing with population growth in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for their work on the African famine relief bill and I hope the House will see fit to pass this important piece of legislation.

But we cannot stop there.

We must strive to consider the comprehensive, long-term measures I have outlined here today as a means of permanently ending the long suffering and misery that is plaguing the people of sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have worked so hard and diligently to put together a very effective and worthwhile bipartisan package, and I think we will get strong support from this House.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of H.R. 1096, the "Africa Relief and Recovery Act of 1985." Africa's compelling need and America's deep humanitarian tradition cried out for this bill and it was born in the true spirit of bipartisanship.

I would like to commend the other main architects of this legislation for their efforts in building this compromise. Without the leadership of Mr. CONTE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. FASCELL this bill certainly would not be in position for final floor vote today. This is crucial. Relief officials on the ground in Africa, grappling with the worst famine of this century, warn of serious disruptions in the delivery of life-saving emergency food aid if new resources are not available in the next weeks.

Today, I ask this House to approve H.R. 1096, providing authorization to spend \$175 million for nonfood assistance in 18 African nations. Of this total, \$137.5 million is earmarked for disaster assistance to provide seeds, farm implements, emergency health care, and so forth. The balance of \$37.5 million will be used for refugee assistance on the continent of Africa where drought and famine have turned millions of residents into unwilling economic nomads.

This nonfood aid will assist in medium-term recovery efforts, linking emergency needs with agriculture development, in order to help avoid conditions which could lead to future famines.

It is absolutely imperative that we strive to maintain the link between emergency food aid and development assistance. We must take care to foster

an atmosphere in which the recipient nation can begin to provide for its own basic needs. Continued dependency on such short-term relief promotes a degradation of a nation's economic and agricultural ability to sustain itself, creating a nation that, in the long-term, cannot survive without such hand-to-mouth emergency food aid.

This bill complements legislation that is now being considered by the Committee on Rules to provide over \$480 million in food aid to the affected nations. Let there be no doubt. These two bills are all that stands between the people of sub-Saharan Africa and a human catastrophe of epic proportions.

As we prepare to vote on these two measures, allow me to address myself of those in the House who, like me, are naturally very cautious about supporting this or other supplemental appropriations requests. Given this Nation's budget situation, your caution is well advised. However, in the case of this bill, there simply is no choice. The fate of an entire generation hangs in the balance.

As ranking Republican of the House Select Committee on Hunger, I had the unparalleled opportunity to visit Ethiopia late last year. Despite intensive personal preparation for the trip, I found myself unready for the experience. The sounds, the smells, and sights of the mass starvation, deprivation and disease I encountered in the Korem and Makelle refugee camps jolted my sensibilities. I stood helpless in the face of the pleadings of the famished and the emaciated.

It was a soul-searing experience which, for me, gave 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 deep humanitarian tradition seems to spring from Donne's words. Accordingly, at the President's personal insistence, the U.S. contribution to the African food relief effort has been second to none. However, as we continue to supply at least 50 percent of all humanitarian aid to Africa, significant policy concerns are emerging.

Disturbing reports of food aid diversion continue to reach us. In the specific case of Ethiopia, a long-running secessionist civil war is hampering relief efforts in the areas hardest hit drought and famine; the Provinces of Eritrea and Tigray in the north. In addition to reports of government attacks on food convoys and refugees, we are especially concerned about the recent Ethiopian Government seizure of food shipments bound for contested areas.

We do not seek to intervene in the domestic affairs of a sovereign nation,

but we must ensure that our food aid is not used as a political weapon. This legislation contains \$2.5 million to provide additional U.S. Government monitoring of food and nonfood assistance distribution.

Further, we must again call on the Government of Ethiopia and opposition groups to ensure safe passage of food aid delivery vehicles and personnel. To this end, all the necessary avenues have not been explored to bring pressure upon the various parties to ensure safe passage. Clearly, the Soviet Union is in the best position to exert influence over the Ethiopian Government to accept this humanitarian proposal. Thus far, the Soviet have been completely recalcitrant and have refused to discuss this important issue with us. I intend to continue working toward this goal with the Department of State and AID. However, these continuing problems with Ethiopians should in no way diminish our humanitarian efforts and moral leadership. This African catastrophe is testing our moral fiber. I am proud that we are not turning our backs, nor are we slow in responding. Consideration of this bill today indicates a clear understanding and sensitivity to the need for immediate action.

I urge my colleagues to join with me and bipartisan sponsors of this bill in strong support of it. Survival of a generation of Africans is within our reach.

□ 1350

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I seldom support foreign aid. I am very much against a lot of the military foreign aid. But this is the kind of foreign aid bill that we should have. This is the thing that goes to the heart of the benevolence of the American people toward people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope it will work out where we do not waste money and that this is properly monitored and does go to help to relieve the actual anguish and relieve the starving people throughout the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SWINDALL].

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, considering H.R. 1096, I am reminded of one of our distinguished former Members of Congress, Davy Crockett, who, one day in the spring of 1830, when the House hastily took up a proposal to appropriate Federal funds for the widow of a distinguished naval officer, after hearing several eloquent speeches urging support of the proposal, at a point when an overwhelming vote in favor appeared imminent, made the following remarks which are equally germane to our debate today.

I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased naval officer as any man in this House of Representatives. But we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living.

I will not—

Davy Crockett continued—

go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every Member of this body knows that we do not. We have the right, as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please to charity, but as Members of Congress we have no right to appropriate even one dollar of the public money for such a purpose. Some eloquent and beautiful appeals have been made to us on the ground that this is a debt due the deceased.

Mr. Speaker I have said we have the right to give as much of our own money as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill but I will give one week's pay to the object, and if every Member of the Congress will do the same, it will amount to more money than this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the same argument is equally appropriate here today.

There are over 25 charitable organizations making direct appeals to the American people, and I for one have made my contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if each Member of this House, rather than spending money which we clearly do not have, which we would clearly have to go and borrow, which would clearly cost us more in terms of adding to the deficit, would simply do the same and urge their various constituents concerned about this issue to do the same, that would be the appropriate measure.

I thank the Speaker.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Chair and I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of my wife, we chartered a stretched DC-8 provided by funds donated by the people of Florida. We filled it with 40 tons of food and medicine and we flew it to Ethiopia in early January.

Now, out of that experience it has changed my life. When my wife held a starving child, along with five other congressional wives last summer, in the northwest of Africa, it changed her life.

So I stand here to support this legislation.

I tell you, it is very interesting that out of the \$175 million, \$110 million is reserved for the grants to the private voluntary organizations. I know that those PVO's all are getting that food into those feeding centers; it is getting to the people that it is intended for.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I commend my House colleagues on the quick and effective action this body is taking to provide relief to drug stricken Africa. Unfortunately, my endorsement has its reservations.

The administration has stated that it will provide one-half of the world's total aid to Africa and to do so we do not need to spend the full amount authorized in this bill. I find it objectionable that in this time of fiscal restraint we have no opportunity to discuss and set the appropriate dollar amount for this relief effort.

I do understand that this bill is a result of the efforts of the committee and the authors of earlier legislation, and I commend them all for their compassionate attention to this need. However, in this era, the House as a whole must reserve the right to debate and establish and to understand the expenditure levels of all of our worthy endeavors.

While recognizing the service provided by the suspension procedures, I do hope for some bipartisan method of handling the truly noncontroversial measures and those narrow issues of controversy in an otherwise acceptable bill.

But, I do, as a Representative of the half a million people, wish to be able to express their concerns and mine for all the needy, including the homeless and hungry outside our very doors, our very own doors.

I also wish to express the concern for future Americans who, because of the deficit, will have to pay for the actions we now take.

I thank the Speaker.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my Michigan colleagues for being the floor managers on this outstanding piece of legislation.

I have been to Africa as well as many of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I suggest we ought to be taking a more long-term solution to this problem. I understand the crisis is immediate, but I would like to suggest that some of us who would be working on a remote sensing, high tech proposal to look at the water tables and water contamination there and look at the problem solving in light of what the Congressman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] outlined, that is, a really self-sustaining program which is important and good public policy for this Nation to be looking at the ultimate solution to this problem rather than looking at appropriations in which we have a major national deficit.

So I would suggest that those of us who are working on the Appropria-

tions Committee will be presenting testimony to the Appropriations Subcommittee and the authorization committee in respect to some high tech projects that will look at the long-term solution for Africa and other nations in the underdeveloped world.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend all of those who have made this legislation possible, bringing it to the floor.

Mr. WEISS, who was in the room, Mr. WOLPE, who is here, and I was with them and Congressman LELAND when we went up to the feeding station north of Gandar in Ethiopia, a large plain where we saw children starving and older Africans almost resigning themselves to their fate of death. Those starving people did not recognize any ideology, they only recognized the fact that death was facing them because of the lack of food.

I want to make one point with reference to the response of the American people: It has been magnificent, but I say a government has just as much a responsibility as does its people to meet a need and to speak to a need and to try to ameliorate human suffering.

This is one of the reasons why I am totally in support of this bill.

□ 1400

I fully concur that we are facing a long-term problem and we need a long-term solution and that long-term solution obviously is in the development of an infrastructure in those countries facing starvation.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1096, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985, because I firmly believe in the relief, rehabilitation, and recovery projects that are provided in this bill.

The world is again witnessing massive hunger and even starvation in Africa—a mere decade after it saw similar human tragedy in Ethiopia, Mali, and other parts of the Sahel. Again people are responding with compassion to the victims of starvation in food aid, but in order to facilitate the recovery process, a fundamental method to support the distribution of food and medical supplies, and to assist the thousands of displaced refugees must be established.

H.R. 1096 would require that of the \$137.5 million authorized for rehabilitation and recovery projects, at least 80 percent be used for grants to private and voluntary organizations and international organizations; at least 18 percent be used for emergency health projects; and \$2.5 million be used for operating expenses monitoring the distribution of emergency food.

Quick action from outside relief is needed in situations of severe famine. However, such aid must be provided wisely. The U.S. Government is playing a leading role in response to famine in Africa today, as it has in other parts of the world at other times. Such governmental response at increased levels is essential and in the best tradition of American humanitarianism, for the needs are beyond the capacities of local governments and voluntary relief agencies. Yet many components of the U.S. Government's response to Africa are designed primarily to meet the actual food need and support services usually go unnoticed. Aid should be given, when possible, in ways which strengthen peoples capacities to be self-sufficient.

For the above stated reasons is why I firmly believe in this bill and I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to addressing this issue forthrightly and cast an affirmative vote for H.R. 1096.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I had the opportunity to visit Ethiopia and spend several nights in the refugee camps. I agree with what the gentleman from Florida had to say.

I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE], if I may, just a question. I am very concerned though that in the northern provinces of Eritrea and Tigre that food is not getting in and wanted to know what is the committee prepared to do about that. Second, if the chairman has contacted the Secretary General of the United Nations to put pressure so that the Secretary General acts. And what can this Congress do to make sure that the Ethiopian Government does not freeze out the people in the northern provinces from getting the food.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLPE. I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for raising that critical question. I and members of my subcommittee have shared fully in the frustrations expressed by a number of Members with the response of the Ethiopian Government to the question of delivery of food into those northern provinces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] has expired.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WOLPE. In response to the gentleman, in fact there is actually right now some food transiting through the

northern provinces through the backdoor essentially, via the Sudan. Our Government is working with the international agencies and with other governments of this world to try to see to it that the Ethiopian Government will grant safe passage to international vehicles so that they can safely transit through that war zone.

I think it also needs to be noted, if I might respond further to the gentleman, that Ethiopia is only 1 of over 20 nations that are experiencing famine and are in urgent need of assistance that this legislation attempts to address.

Finally, even with respect to Ethiopia nearly all of the assistance that is being directed to that country is flowing through the private voluntary agencies, American private voluntary agencies, most notably the Catholic Relief Services.

I share the concern the gentleman has raised. I and my colleagues have been in conversation with Ethiopian Government officials doing everything we can to encourage safe passage and to try to see to it that the northern territories receive the food allocations that are so desperately required.

Mr. WOLF. Has the gentleman thought of contacting the Secretary General of the United Nations about this matter?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has expired.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], who has been a real advocate of this legislation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, Mr. FASCELL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. BROOMFIELD, for their swift attention to this critical issue, and for the truly bipartisan authorization that has been reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee under their leadership. Deciding on an appropriate level of non-food aid as a component of an African relief bill was a difficult task, and not one without controversy. But through their leadership in committee, the package that comes before us today is a responsible bill that meets the African nonfood need, and I am happy to lend my support to passage of H.R. 1096.

The dimensions of the African tragedy boggle the mind—18 countries in sub-Saharan Africa in desperate need of food, 150 million people touched in some way by the drought, and some 10 million people in direct danger of starvation. The U.S. response to this crisis—both in government aid and private contributions—has been a high compliment to the capacity for "man's humanity to man." But it is clear that more aid is required. In fashioning a relief package, the primary focus must be the provision of adequate amounts

of food aid, but an appropriate measure of disaster and refugee assistance is also critically needed. In addition, beyond the particulars of any bill, Congress must act swiftly if the emergency aid we decide to provide is to be effective. Mr. Peter McPherson, Director of AID, has advised that he needs a supplemental by March 1 if there is not to be a disruption in African assistance.

Recognizing the need for fast-track consideration of an African relief bill, Congresswoman ROUKEMA, and Congressmen WEISS, WOLPE, and LELAND, and I—the five principal sponsors of the Africa supplementals before the House—met over the February recess in an effort to reach agreement amongst ourselves on this pressing issue. Those discussions included the chairman, Mr. FASCELL, and the ranking member, Mr. BROOMFIELD, of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and H.R. 1096 represents the product of those efforts with respect to nonfood aid. It is a responsible package that is sensitive to the deficit pressures we face here at home, but recognizes that an African relief bill must also provide an appropriate measure of nonfood aid if lives are to be saved—and new lives started.

H.R. 1096 contains two major components. First, it provides \$137.5 million in disaster assistance that is broken down into three categories. Of the total, \$110 million is made available for relief, rehabilitation, and recovery projects such as providing seeds, farm implements, blankets clothing, water projects, and other emergency-related disaster projects. Approximately \$25 million is earmarked for emergency health care projects, in recognition of the fact that famine and disease are partners in any drought. In addition, in response to recent reports that the Ethiopian Government has sought to block shipments of food to rebel-controlled regions of that country, \$2.5 million is allocated to increase AID monitoring to help ensure that U.S. aid goes to those starving people, regardless of political affiliation. Our aid is not for governments, but for starving people who often have little or no influence on the political realities that now threaten to consume them.

Second, H.R. 1096 contains \$37.5 million in refugee assistance. Many African countries are doing what they can in providing assistance to the ever-growing refugee population. Yet, one need only consider the crisis situation in the Sudan to appreciate the tremendous burden being assumed by host countries in responding to the massive migration taking place on the African Continent. Of the \$37.5 million total, \$20 million is made available for ICARA II projects and \$17.5 million is authorized for the State De-

partment's Bureau of Refugee Programs.

Finally, H.R. 1096 recognizes that determining an appropriate amount of relief is a numbers game, and the numbers are constantly changing. Therefore, the bill directs the President to submit to the Congress a mid-year needs assessment not later than June 30. This report would assess the projected African food and nonfood needs for the remainder of the fiscal year, together with a projection of the total funding required to provide an appropriate U.S. contribution toward meeting those needs. If current funding levels are insufficient to meet the desired U.S. commitment, the President is urged to request additional supplemental funding sufficient to meet that purpose.

H.R. 1096 meets the emergency, non-food needs of Africa, and is a critical component of the overall relief package that this House will be considering this week. I urge my colleagues to approve its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I might say for those who are worried that this is on a suspension, on Thursday, my committee, Appropriations Committee, will bring out a bill which is almost 99 percent of this bill which will be in the appropriation bill. That was the part of the thing that we hammered out with the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] and others.

I am going up to the Rules Committee in a few minutes. We will ask for an open rule and if Members want to offer amendments at that time, they can offer all the amendments they would like to the appropriations bill.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER], the new ranking member on the Subcommittee on Africa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. SILJANDER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that all of us as we deliberate this very timely issue realize with a heart of compassion and a vision for long-term needs for Africa that while this bill may not be perfect in all of our eyes and there may be some philosophical flaws in many points of view, this is in all political reference a good positive compromise.

So I would urge the Members to support this bill as it has come from the right to the left to something around in the center to address the needs of those in desperate situations on the African Continent.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to simply state once again to my colleagues how much

I appreciate the extraordinary bipartisan effort.

Let me express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from Michigan and now the ranking member of the full committee and to my other distinguished colleague from Michigan, who is now the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa for their assistance in this effort and also to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONRE] who has played an absolutely key role in the appropriations process.

Two points have really been made in the course of this debate that really bear repeating. There is a short-term crisis and there is a long-term problem to be solved. In the short-term, literally hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of lives—the estimates actually range in the millions—are at risk if there is not an immediate infusion of food and nonfood assistance from not only the United States, but from the international community as well.

It needs to be emphasized, the United States cannot do it alone. We must call upon the rest of the world to respond and it is the generosity of this response contained in this legislation and the generosity that has been manifest in the response of the American people individually and to the private voluntary agencies that has set an absolutely extraordinary standard and it is my hope will really inspire similar levels of contribution assistance from the rest of the world.

We then must tackle the second problem which is that of developing a long-term development effort. This is much more difficult. It does not have always the crisis appeal. And my fear, very frankly, is, what will happen when the cameras are turned off.

I think that maybe the dimensions of the crisis that is now facing the continent has helped all of us within the United States and hopefully within other industrial nations to understand the importance of working with African governments and societies to turn around the agricultural situation within that continent.

In India some years ago the same kind of crisis was being experienced. But in cooperation with international communities India today has become much more self-sufficient in food production. We can be just as successful working with the African governments in order to see that that continent likewise experiences greater self-sufficiency in food production. That will be the continuing challenge facing this body and facing our own governmental response.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1096 which provides disaster assistance to those suffering from famine in Africa. The committees involved in this legislation are to be commended for their prompt response to a continuing crisis situation.

We are all aware of the problem. We have all been moved by television pictures of those in Africa who are on the brink of starvation. The stories of suffering and death in Africa brought on by drought and inadequate policy measures have continued almost daily. The African tragedy has produced staggering statistics that, while giving some idea of the scope of the problem, fail to communicate the individual pain of losing a loved one, the break-up of families, the arrested mental development of children who survive the crisis. Indeed it is the children who are most affected by the food shortage—children who will form the next generation of Africans and represent some semblance of hope in a bleak situation.

There are a number of good reasons to support this measure and an increased appropriation of Public Law 480 food assistance. Chief among them is the moral responsibility we have as Americans to offer assistance.

The famine in Africa tests us as individuals and a nation. How we respond speaks volumes about the kind of people we are and about our principles as a nation. We have the resources to respond. This legislation indicates our will to respond. The generosity and caring of the American people have been apparent in an outpouring of contributions to private organizations and support for previous legislation to address this problem. The crisis continues in Africa. It asks of us, on the basis of our respective religious convictions and our decency as fellow human beings, to respond as a nation as well.

Concern for fellow human beings in need is a sufficient justification for this measure, but there are reasons beyond humanitarian appeals as well. We stand ready to alleviate the poverty and inequality that provide fertile ground for those promoting communism. It is also in our interest to promote and support viable economies around the world that can serve as valuable trading partners and provide markets for our goods.

The legislation we are considering continues a tradition of generous response to crisis on the part of the United States. The food assistance levels to be appropriated as a supplement to present Public Law 480 assistance should provide approximately half of the food requirements for Africa this year. Private contributions and the actions of other donor countries will help to meet the overall needs of the continent but the U.S. role is crucial. We hold, in our hands, resources which give us the opportunity to give life or withhold it. Recent estimates indicate that as many as 150 million people, a number that represents more than half the population of the United States, may be in danger of starvation in Africa. In a very real sense, we are responsible for those

lives for we hold the means to provide life—this legislation gives us an opportunity to vote prolife in an international context.

Moreover, this legislation goes beyond mere food assistance to alleviate a short-term crisis. Disaster assistance funds can be used to purchase seeds, agricultural implements, and fertilizer which are crucial, not only to alleviation of present shortages, but to long-term development progress in Africa. Funds for resettlement of refugees fleeing famine are also important for moving Africa from dependency on this kind of aid to self-sufficiency in food production. Our overriding goal is to prevent future crisis of this nature.

This disaster assistance will be funneled, in large part, through private voluntary organizations and international institutions. These organizations have a proven track record of effective action in meeting the needs of the world's hungry and poor. They represent the most effective channels for the kind of response we as Americans hope to make.

In urging support for these measures, I refer again to our responsibility—as a nation and as representatives charged with the formation of foreign policy—to show concern for those in need. As the respected former Senator from my home State of Minnesota, Hubert H. Humphrey, stated in support of the Food-for-Peace Program he was so instrumental in passing some 20 years ago:

We urgently need to design and launch a broad-gauged and affirmative foreign policy on the natural strengths of our nation—yes, to harness to the plow of foreign policy our tremendous industrial capacity, our abundant capital, our technical knowledge, our agricultural abundance, our wealth of trained educators, agriculturalists, administrators, doctors, and students.

I believe one of the most powerful weapons for peace is our food power. . . In the long run, our food power—far more than military power—can be the critical factor in the achievement both of democratic institutions and of safety in the world. Food power is our secret weapon. Food is life. Food is strength. Food is hope and compassion. Food is the giver of health and vigor to children. Food is the vital ingredient of social stability and peaceful change. Let us use that power wisely and well.

Mr. Speaker, I second the sentiments of Hubert Humphrey for they are applicable in the present context. I urge prompt passage of this legislation and the supplemental appropriations to Public Law 480 for African famine relief.

● Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, as Members of this great body, we face many difficult decisions during the coming months. We have the prospect of ever increasing Government deficits if we do not change the way we make decisions on how we spend the taxpayers' money. We must begin to consider the efficiency of the programs we authorize. In almost every Government

agency we can find waste and in many programs we find that they have been overfunded at the start and expenditures have risen to meet those funds rather than having funding to meet the real needs of the program. In most cases these are good and necessary programs which simply are not managed economically.

The African famine relief bill is just such a program. The Reagan administration has detailed a plan to provide \$1 billion in food and other aid to Africa. These funds will come from a combination of funds already appropriated for food aid, redirected funds, and from \$25 million in supplemental appropriations. Instead of providing these funds the President has requested, H.R. 1096 provides a great deal more than is necessary. The administration believes that this additional amount cannot be effectively administered and is therefore not prudent. The President's plan will be more effective at dealing with the crisis in Africa without spending excessive amounts of money which will do little if anything to help the people of Ethiopia. For this reason I oppose the passage of H.R. 1096.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, when disaster strikes any nation in the world, a measure of our stature as world citizens is reflected in our response to help those in need. The continuing situation in Africa demands that we take additional action now. Two dozen African countries are suffering from the consequences of a decade-long drought which has left their countries devastated, and their people starving. We have provided some assistance in the past, but this is clearly not enough. We are embarked now upon a course which will provide additional food and medical assistance that is critical to those struggling to stay alive in their own countries and to those who have been forced to flee their country of origin. Time is of essence and we must lose not a moment more.

Today we have before us the first of these measures. Hopefully, by the end of the week the next stage of our relief effort will be complete. The bill we are considering now will authorize \$175 million for medical supplies, clothing, shelter, and related disaster assistance for African countries to help them take care of their own and for refugees. These moneys will be funneled to those countries which have been particularly hard hit during 1984 and 1985. With passage we will also ensure that the aid will reach those for whom it was intended, and that we will receive a full reporting from the President by June 30 of this year concerning what must still be done in fiscal year 1985.

I strongly urge my colleagues toward swift passage of H.R. 1096.●

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1096, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, and as a Member of Congress who has had the opportunity to view the horror in Ethiopia on two occasions, I cannot express in strong enough terms the imperative for expediting passage of both the authorization measure before us today, and the appropriation bill that we will consider on Thursday.

The tragedy in Africa has spurred an overwhelming and uniquely American response from our Government, and from the citizens of this country. Sadly, it will take a sustained effort over several years to provide a subsistence level of food for many of the starving people on the African Continent. One of the most disturbing facts that we should not overlook, however, is that, despite the outpouring of efforts by the donor countries and private voluntary agencies, this year will still find a dramatic shortage of food supplies in many African countries. Millions of people will remain unfed and will perish, despite the best efforts of the relief workers, who seek to alleviate the suffering in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just 1 minute to express my thoughts on some of the specific provisions of this bill. Today, the Congress is taking an important step toward securing a comprehensive legislative response to the crisis. In addition to providing food and transportation—which do not require additional authorization at this time—the House is acting in a number of other areas that must be addressed if the relief efforts are to be effective. Of particular importance are funds for rehabilitation and recovery. This money will go toward furnishing such items as seeds for planting, fertilizer, pesticides, farm animals, blankets, clothing, shelter, disease-prevention efforts, health care, water and small-scale agriculture projects, and food-protection and preservation programs.

In addition, the bill provides funds for refugee assistance. The problem of displaced persons has intensified in recent weeks, as thousands of Africans have fled their homes and crossed international boundaries in search of food. It is imperative that the relief organizations have funds for both immediate relief and short-term development assistance projects, to increase the chances that those seeking refuge from this devastating famine will survive. Finally, the legislation provides a waiver of the Hickenlooper amendment, in the case of funds that might be restricted by an overly narrow interpretation of this law, where outstanding claims against American property have interfered with the pursuit of certain relief efforts. This will

help ensure both the expedited delivery of food, and the drilling of wells that will provide a source of fresh water at feeding centers in Ethiopia.

Mr. Speaker, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act is a clear statement of the humanitarian nature of the American people. It is a gesture of our desire to assist those who cannot help themselves now. After my two recent trips of the famine-stricken African Continent, one particular aspect of this tragedy remains firmly in mind. It is the children, both those on the verge of death, and those who remained buoyant and determined to preserve life, who must motivate all of us in this House to pass the legislation before us today.

The human toll of this disaster cannot be fully described here, but we must stop to contemplate the ramifications of this famine: Families destroyed; children left brain-damaged; the anguish of a slow, tortuous death for thousands of innocent men, women, and children. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this legislation will be a significant step in saving precious lives, but even with the most dedicated relief effort humanly possible, lives will be lost. That sobering thought should motivate speedy adoption of these supplemental efforts.●

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa bill. Today, some 14 to 20 million people in 20 African countries face a desperate situation. A combination of events, including drought and misguided political policies, have created a situation where entire populations are threatened with death from starvation. This crisis has been building for years, but as nearly every American knows by now, it must be addressed now. Every day that we wait, countless individuals face death or permanent physical and mental disability due to malnutrition.

This bill will facilitate the distribution of emergency food assistance to the famine victims. It will get food to people who need it. The bill will also provide seeds for planting, fertilizer, pesticides, farm equipment, livestock and other necessary items to help restore food production in famine afflicted areas.

Those famine victims who suffer from associated health problems will be helped by this legislation, as well. Emergency health projects will provide vaccinations and other treatment. Disease prevention programs will also be implemented.

Most of the assistance provided by this bill will be used for grants to private and voluntary organizations that have already demonstrated their ability to provide aid to the victims. In all, \$137.5 million will be provided. Additional legislation providing \$1 billion in emergency food assistance will be considered later this week.

The United States should not be expected to permanently provide for the food needs of Africa. This is something the African people can do for themselves. International relief and development agencies, along with our own Agency for International Development and private voluntary organizations are working with African governments to enhance farming techniques and food distribution to eventually eliminate food shortages and famine. In a number of cases, more effective and reasonable government policies are necessary, as well. And, of course, the rains have to return. In parts of southern Africa currently gripped by famine, that has already happened.

Recent history records other cases where concerted efforts led to self-sufficiency for countries that once experienced chronic hunger, even starvation. I am confident that the African countries that are now wracked by famine will be able to provide for all the food needs of their people. Until favorable circumstances are established, however, we have an obligation to help. This legislation is a serious response to a serious problem. Immediate aid must be provided and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for emergency African relief.●

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation that this measure is being brought up today in such a timely manner. As we are well aware, scores of individuals are perishing in Africa while awaiting food and other assistance; I am pleased that we have given H.R. 1096 the priority that such legislation deserves.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 1096, the compromise African famine relief bill developed by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the select committee on Hunger, I would like to direct special recognition to Congresswoman ROUKEMA, ranking Republican member of the select committee, and her staff for their efforts on this relief package.

I would like to commend and acknowledge as well the diligent and fine work of Congressmen WEISS, WOLFE, LELAND, and CONTE. Their interest and efforts have assured that an effective, compassionate bill is before us today, one which reflects their desire to work for the common good.

The legislation before us, and its companion bill in the Senate, provides not only much-needed food for starving people, but also includes funds for recovery and rehabilitation of parched agricultural lands. Such assistance is as important as the emergency aid if we are to respond to the long-term problem of many African countries. Unless we make extra efforts now to assist drought-stricken farmers in such undertakings as the rehabilitation of water and sanitation facilities and the

resumption of agricultural production, the crisis will not abate.

Our aid program must be two-tracked: Feed today's hungry, while at the same time assist in various agricultural and technical programs that will enable these people to feed themselves in the months and years ahead.

Recent reports from private voluntary agencies in Africa, as well as from the United Nations, indicate that the food crisis appears to be worsening daily in a number of African countries. Twenty-nine nations have been seriously affected by the drought. As a result, hundreds of thousands of Africans from many nations have starved to death, and millions more are in imminent danger of a similar fate.

At the same time, our Nation faces serious problems, from the ballooning budget deficit to the crisis on our farms. These problems deserve, and will receive, our persistent attention and hardest labors. I do not believe, however, that this effort will be undertaken to the exclusion of assisting those who, by simple virtue of their birthplace, will die from a lack of food. America's commitment to those in need is ingrained in our national character; we honor that character to an even greater degree by responding to others despite our own difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the emergency funding measure before us today so that the aid relief can be dispatched quickly to those looking to us for help.●

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in support of a desperately needed supplemental authorization bill for the people of Africa. I congratulate the authors of this legislation for preparing an aid package that not only authorizes emergency food but complements this assistance with needed long-term, disaster and refugee problems.

As my colleagues know, the situation in 28 nations on the African Continent is dismal. One hundred fifty million peoples' lives are at stake from the effects of a 3 year drought that shows no signs of subsiding. It is imperative that we act now in a bipartisan manner to provide these nations with essential and lifesaving humanitarian aid.

We have all seen the horrifying pictures of small children dying from starvation. Some of my colleagues have traveled to Africa to see firsthand the tragic effect of this famine. As one of the world's wealthiest nations, we have a responsibility to come to the aid of these people in the face of this crisis. Traditionally, America has provided 50 percent of needed emergency relief. The bill that we have before us today maintains this tradition.

Mr. Speaker both the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee have acted expeditiously to move this legislation to the House floor. The American people have demonstrated their support for continued and adequate aid to Africa through their generous donations to private organizations. This total has already reached an estimated \$60 million. I urge my colleagues to follow both the lead of these two committees and that of the American people and vote unanimously for this supplemental authorization bill. ●

● Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1096, the African Disaster Assistance Act as overwhelmingly passed by this body today.

American farmers have the know-how and skill to feed the world. That's no secret. America's also got the most generous folks in the world, living within her borders. Just look at the outpouring of food, money and other help given freely by churches, schools, other groups and individuals themselves, in response to the famine in Africa. What America doesn't have is a money tree—our farmers perform miracles but growing this variety of green stuff isn't one of them.

Those of us gathered here today are no different, no less generous than our fellow Americans, and of course we want to give more than we rightly can. But we know about the deficit and, what's more, we're expected to do something about it. For this reason, I support H.R. 1096, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985.

This bill was created in an atmosphere of compromise which is only attained after everybody presents their first and best idea. The package we have before us today is the result of this fine-tuning process, and now it's time to move on and support this worthwhile measure. To spend more time verbally jousting would be to waste time, and perhaps waste innocent lives.

Sometimes, no matter how hard you work on what you believe is a worthy and important project, you don't feel much satisfaction, only fatigue. We've all been there, I'm sure. But, you know, being a member of the Select Committee on Hunger has added a new dimension to my job here, and a new perspective to my life, and how I view the world around me. It has made me grateful for all that those aspects of my life that I took for granted. More importantly, though, it forces you to become an optimist, for you truly realize that for some folks, things can only get better. And with the passage of the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985, they will.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of H.R. 1096, the authoriza-

tion for additional appropriations for African famine relief, I take a few moments of my colleagues to discuss some aspects of this tragic situation that deserve our careful consideration.

Africa, once a net exporter of food, has suffered progressive deterioration in agricultural capacity in the postcolonial period. There are multiple causes for this situation. The Congress cannot afford to overlook all of them, while providing generous assistance to those at risk.

Clearly, as one publication has stated—

(t)he food crisis in Africa is the worst since the early 1970's when about a quarter of a million people starved to death * * * Even mammoth amounts of aid would afford Africa only a brief respite. The reason for this is that when favorable climatic conditions return African food output will not be able to keep pace with demand, but, in fact, will decline if recent trends continue.

We will hear much during this debate, and that on the subsequent appropriations bill, about the pressing need for food. How "need" is defined and measured has been one of the reasons why this legislation has been so long delayed since the Congress convened on January 3. I appreciate the complexity of this question, and its importance, and would suggest to my colleagues that there are those in Congress who see almost a bottomless vortex of food need for Africa. The United States and other Western humanitarian donors, governmental and private, simply lack the capacity to feed all the needy people in Africa, no matter how one defined "need." Our policy goal must be to move with dispatch and singleness of purpose toward major policy changes that will assist Africans to feed themselves. We can only do this if we begin by adding an extremely effective policy component to our emergency food programs for that continent.

Like most Members of this House, Mr. Chairman, I wish we could solve the food shortages and end the starvation throughout Africa. But this will never be accomplished so long as local government agricultural marketing and planting policies repress the production. I note with great interest that a number of African leaders who have, at least in the past, favored Marxist rhetoric, are now showing more support for nationalism. Faced with the potential starvation of their people, they are taking the hard steps to radically reform food-production and marketing policies. One of these leaders is Didier Ratsiraka, President of Madagascar. In his country, an island the size of Texas, the staple food is rice. Since the end of French colonial rule, Madagascar has experimented with Marxist economics and has discovered, as is universally the case, that this model fails miserably.

President Ratsiraka could have chosen the ideological route of Colonel Mengistu in Ethiopia, but his concern for the prosperity of his own people impelled him to decontrol the price to rice farmers and to allow the price of commercial rice to float with the market. In this, the United States, through its Ambassador, Robert B. Keating, and Deputy Chief of Mission, David Rawson, had a positive influence in providing examples of how the free market could produce more food.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that these dramatic policy shifts which were undertaken in 1984, were done in the light of devastation by two cyclones to the island's agriculture. Progress can continue there, now extending to the spice trade, the country's major source of foreign exchange, with this continued enlightened leadership. I might add, that the Government of Madagascar is not my ideal for Africa. But the United States and other Western donors have done more by showing a nationalistic leader examples of the possibility of an improved life for his people than by merely supplying emergency food shipments into a situation which continues to decline.

It would be most useful to overlay the food-short countries of Africa with a map of the ideological leanings of their regimes. When Cuban occupation armies are not present, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect that drought might only be a precipitant to disaster—the major cause being the policies of the regime. Adoption of Marxist-Leninist economic models is, of course, the choice of the particular African regime under question. But for these same governments to expect Western donors to bail them out absent policy shifts doesn't make much sense.

I know these changes are hard. Some Western food donors believe that a centralized economic system is ideal. Some Western private groups believe that the form of economic organization is unrelated to the need of the people to be fed. In suggesting linkage, I in no way suggest we use a litmus test on countries. Merely, we as Americans should do all in our power to assure that internal economic policies assist rather than hamper food production.

Some governments deny access to food as a routine matter to those seeking to unseat the regime; nonmembers of the armed forces; and people who do not live in cities. Some of these same regimes forcibly move their people, increasing the chances of starvation, or actually sell donated Western food on the international market. There is no worse African situation than Ethiopia in this regard.

Should the United States deny food assistance? Of course not, Mr. Speaker. Should the United States collaborate with the Cuban army of occupa-

tion which props up the regime? Also, the answer is of course not.

Over the long term however, there does come a point when U.S. policy ought to look to the legitimacy of a government before allowing it to process U.S. assistance. In Angola, for example, the Dos Santos regime in Luanda is probably supported by far fewer Angolans than the UNITA resistance movement under Jonas Savimbi. If we are to provide humanitarian assistance to Dos Santos and his Cuban backers, we ought to at least do the same to the followers of Savimbi. To do otherwise would be to allow an illegitimate regime to choose whom to benefit. There's a lesson in this for the people in Tigray and Eritrea.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, the food shortage in Africa can only be overcome by Africans themselves. Even with the encroachment of the Sahara on the Sahelian countries, even with occasional droughts or storms, the key must be to assist in construction of regional arrangements. One excellent example exists between various nations of southern Africa. Since the signing of the important Nkomati accords in 1984, and followup agreements with other countries of the region, cooperation for development has occurred between the Republic of South Africa and her neighbors.

How can the United States encourage this approach? Certainly, the provision of Public Law 480 as appropriate to all countries of a region is important. agricultural development projects aimed at export trade rather than self-sufficiency and based on the comparative advantage of countries are essential. Mozambique cannot hope to increase her seafood exports unless overfishing by Soviet-bloc ships ceases. Landlocked Botswana and Zimbabwe need port access. Opportunities exist for cooperation and cooperative engagement should be pursued in regional development wherever possible.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are and continue to be motivated by a generosity characteristic of the West. Our hearts and hands go out to the starving in Africa, even if their right to eat has been reduced by agricultural policies of their own governments or even if they are victims of selective starvation from the same source.

We must underpin our efforts as embodied in H.R. 1096 with a clear program to move toward the institution of market forces in African agriculture, encourage regional cooperation, and provide assistance on an absolutely nonpolitical basis. ●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in strong support of H.R. 1096, the African disaster assistance bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a tragedy unfolding on the continent of Africa. Due to a number of factors, including a combination of a drop in food pro-

ductivity and rapidly rising population, and adverse political factors, Africa is now in the grips of a famine of astounding proportions. We have all seen the photographs of the sick, malnourished, and starving African men, women, and children. We have all seen the photographs of the mothers holding their babies, helplessly watching them die for lack of food. We have all seen photographs of the swollen bellies and vacant faces of our fellow human beings too weak even to eat. We have all seen the suffering so great that one cannot help but be profoundly moved.

The unrelenting famine on the continent of Africa has seriously affected 29 nations and over 20 million people. Its scope is difficult to fathom. The United States has mounted an unprecedented campaign to provide assistance to Africa in its hour of great need. We are the largest donor to the emergency there, and H.R. 1096 is our latest effort.

The bill before us, which I am pleased to coauthor and which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I sit, authorizes \$175 million for medical supplies, clothing, shelter, and related disaster assistance for people in Africa suffering from severe drought conditions. Although these funds are intended for nonfood items, there is no prohibition in the bill on using the funds for food aid. Of the \$175 million, \$137.5 million is for disaster assistance, including relief, rehabilitation, and recovery projects. \$37.5 million is for refugee assistance programs. In addition, the bill requires the President to ensure that the food aid reaches those for whom it is intended, and requires the President to report to Congress not later than June 30, 1985 on what African food and disaster assistance needs will be for the remainder of fiscal 1986.

H.R. 1096 is part of a larger, bipartisan compromise that includes a second bill, H.R. 1239, appropriating additional funds in fiscal year 1985 for acquisition and shipment of 1.1 million metric tons of food through the Food for Peace title II program to be voted on in this body on Thursday.

I will vote for H.R. 1096, the African disaster assistance bill today, and for H.R. 1239, the supplemental appropriations for Africa relief, on Thursday and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The direct response of the American people and the private sector to the suffering in Africa has been impressive and has resulted in the saving of many lives and the easing of suffering. As representatives of the American people, let us join them in their desire to help those in need. We are so very fortunate to live in this land of bounty and freedom. We have a moral responsibility to help those less fortunate. It

is true that this is a time of budgetary constraint, but we must be generous when we can ease the suffering and save the lives of those in such great need.

I want to commend my colleagues on both the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations for acting quickly to bring these bills to the floor. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these measures to help the suffering in Africa.

Thank you. ●

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1096, the African Famine Relief and Recovery Act of 1985. Sub-Saharan Africa is suffering from the most severe, chronic hunger problem in the world today. For the 150 to 200 million people in this region, severe food shortage has become a fact of life. Nearly 20 million people are at risk today of outright starvation. Hundreds of thousands have already died. The response of the American public to this problem has been great, but thus far the response of our Government has not. Unless the Congress acts now to provide adequate food and disaster relief assistance to the 30 countries in Africa that are affected, this already tragic situation will only grow worse.

I recently traveled to Africa with my distinguished colleague from Michigan, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, HOWARD WOLPE. We visited some of the areas in Mozambique where people have been among those most affected by the drought. What we saw and learned left no doubt that the level of need is great. The measure before us takes a step in the direction of reducing the famine, but by no stretch of the imagination will this be adequate given the magnitude of the problem. Because of America's wealth and agricultural productivity, we can respond to this crisis by providing 50 percent of the total estimated food requirements that must be supplied by the donor countries. But food alone is only a short-term, stopgap answer to the problem.

For the past two decades, per capita agricultural production in Africa has been declining. This has in part been the result of a lack of rain over the past 3 years. However, other factors such as rapid population growth, poor farming techniques, and soil degradation have played a role in the development of this crisis. Long term community focused agricultural assistance is essential if sub-Saharan Africa is to overcome the effects of this disaster. We can contribute the agricultural research and education necessary to expand food production, but we must be careful to provide this aid in a manner which fosters self-sufficiency and not dependency.

I realize that Africa cannot be restored to health in a single congressional term. It will take several years to accomplish that. What is necessary now, however, is to commit ourselves to the task of helping Africans stabilize their food supplies so that refugees can return to their villages, and farmers return to the task of growing food. We have got a big job to do in a short period of time and I am certain that the rest of the nations of the world are determined to do their share in this humanitarian campaign to end hunger. Failure condemns millions to a horrible death. That is a price too costly for anyone to pay. ●

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in support of legislation to provide desperately needed emergency relief funds. As death, starvation and severe malnutrition continue to plague African countries, it is incumbent upon nations like the United States to act swiftly and generously to overcome these famine conditions.

The measure before us is certainly a viable attempt on the part of our country to respond both effectively and efficiently to this crisis. According to Government reports, up to 20 million people in Africa face possible disability and death over the next year if food is not provided. And unless we show compassion and vote for H.R. 1096 millions of people will die as a result of hunger.

Mr. Speaker, the starving, dying faces of millions of Africans continue to receive front page coverage in newspapers, magazines and are the topic of much debate on television. My heart pours out to the mothers of dying children, the homeless refugees and the proud but suffering people of Ethiopia, Sudan, Mozambique, Tanzania, and other nations in Africa. The United States must continue its commitment to provide relief, save lives, and avert mass starvation.

I hope my colleagues will join me in answering the calls for assistance. We cannot sit by in comfort while devastation and drought conditions aggravate famine conditions and condemn millions to death. Vote for the passage of H.R. 1096. ●

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1096.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

COST SAVINGS DISCLOSURE AWARDS EXTENSION

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 607) to provide for a continuation of the authority to pay cash awards to Federal employees for certain cost savings disclosures, and to clarify the authority to provide cash awards to members of the Armed Forces for such disclosures.

□ 1410

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) Section 4514 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4514. Expiration of authority; reporting requirement

"(a) No award may be made under this subchapter after September 30, 1988.

"(b)(1) The Comptroller General shall submit to each House of Congress, before March 16, 1988, a report on the effectiveness of the awards program under this subchapter.

"(2) The report shall include the views of the Comptroller General as to whether the authority to make awards under this subchapter should be continued after September 30, 1988, and, if so, whether any modification in such authority would be appropriate."

(2) The table of sections for chapter 45 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item relating to section 4514 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"4514. Expiration of authority; reporting requirement."

(b) Section 4512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1124 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "disclosure," in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (f) before "suggestion".

(b)(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1124. Cash awards for disclosures, suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 57 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"1124. Cash awards for disclosures, suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) applies only with respect to disclosures made after September 30, 1984.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, a second is not required on this motion.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1985, I introduced H.R. 607, a bill to revitalize and extend the authority for agency inspectors general and the President to pay cash awards to employees whose disclosures for fraud, waste, or mismanagement result in cost savings to the Government. H.R. 607 contains a simple extension of the authority of agency inspectors general and the President to make cash awards to Federal employees who disclose waste.

Specifically, this measure amends section 4514 of title 5, United States Code, to extend until September 30, 1988, the authority of agency inspectors general—or other officials designated to exercise the authority where the agency has no inspector general—and the President to grant awards for cost-savings disclosures. This awards authority was established in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 to encourage and reward Federal employees for pursuing improvements in Government.

H.R. 607 is similar to H.R. 5646, a bill reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on September 24, 1984, passed by the House on September 24, 1984, and passed by the Senate, as amended, on October 11, 1984. Objection was heard in the House to considering the House bill with Senate amendments on October 11, 1984. The objection was prompted by an amendment added by the Senate which was vigorously opposed by the administration. That controversial amendment is not contained in H.R. 607.

H.R. 607 also does not contain any dependent care provisions, any postal provisions, or any dual compensation provisions. All were added onto H.R. 5646 last year in the dying days of the session. The report to accompany H.R. 5646 (H. Rept. 98-1053) should be considered as the legislative history for H.R. 607 insofar as the language in H.R. 607 is the same as the language in H.R. 5646.

Since very few awards were given by agency inspectors general and none by the President during the 3 years of the program, it was felt by the committee and the agencies that the program could not be fully evaluated. For that reason, the committee decided to authorize it for an additional test period so as to provide needed time to more fully assess its value and effectiveness. The bill requires the General Account-

ing Office [GAO] to issue a report prior to March 16, 1988, containing recommendations on whether the awards program should be made permanent.

The 1981 act required the GAO to examine each and every award given and determine whether the cost-savings were verified. GAO feels that the case-by-case review requirement is duplicative since agency inspectors general are already doing the same thing. H.R. 607 relieves GAO of this burden. Still, we expect that GAO will review and report on the numbers and amounts of awards given, the amounts and types of cost savings, as well as the effectiveness of the program.

In addition, the bill responds to a request of the Department of Defense that the inspector general of DOD be permitted the authority to grant cash awards to members of the military services who make cost-savings disclosures. H.R. 607 includes language recommended by the Committee on Armed Services to amend section 1124 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the DOD IG such authority. On February 19, 1985, Chairman ASPIN of the Committee on Armed Services wrote Chairman FORD of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to state that he had no objection to taking H.R. 607 to the House floor under suspension of the rules. I will include a copy of Chairman ASPIN's letter in the RECORD at the end of my statement.

Although the awards program did, in fact, expire on September 30, 1984, it is the committee's intention that any cost-savings disclosure made after this time should still be eligible for consideration of award.

The administration has said that it supports a 3-year extension of the cost-savings awards program. I, therefore, urge adoption of this legislation.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, February 19, 1985.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: Your committee has before it H.R. 607, a bill to extend the authority to pay cash awards to Federal employees who make cost-saving disclosures. Because the bill would also amplify the authority to pay cash awards to members of the armed forces who make such disclosures, it was jointly referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

I am told that you intend to move the bill under suspension of the rules. I would have no objection to your doing so. Of course, I note the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services over legislation affecting the authority to pay awards to members of the armed forces.

The provision of H.R. 607 that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services would clarify section 1124 of title 10, United States Code. That section provides for awards of as much as \$25,000 to members of the armed forces for suggestions, inventions, or scientific achievements that contribute to efficiency, economy, or

other improvements in the operation of the armed forces. H.R. 607 would amend section 1124 to clarify that a "disclosure" by a member of the armed forces could confer eligibility for an award just as a "suggestion, invention, or scientific achievement" could. I would expect the Secretary of Defense to regulate the award for disclosure in conformity with its Federal civilian counterpart.

I would appreciate your using this letter to help explain and record the jurisdictional circumstances involved in your moving this bill. I look forward to our working together on other matters that affect our respective jurisdictions.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Chairman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 607, a bill that would extend the Inspector General Awards Programs for disclosure by Federal employees of fraud, waste, and mismanagement, among other purposes. A similar bill, H.R. 5646, was considered by the House during the 98th Congress. H.R. 607 continues the authority of the inspectors general to make cash awards for disclosures of fraud, waste, and mismanagement until fiscal year 1989. The administration supports this 3-year extension. The Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office is required to report to Congress 6 months before the program expires, on the effectiveness of the awards program and whether it should be continued. GAO is relieved of the responsibility to verify the cost savings at their request. In the past, GAO has found the agencies' documentation of the savings has been accurate. The bill also will allow the Secretary of Defense to make similar awards to military employees for cost-savings disclosures.

Before this program expired last fall, Federal agencies were just beginning to carry out their Inspector General Awards Programs. Thus far, four agencies have made eight awards which have saved over \$1 million. Not a bad start, but I look forward to the inspectors general expanding their programs and giving as many awards as are documentable in the next 3 years. Including military and naval employees of the Department of Defense into the IG program is an equitable solution to a problem unique to the DOD: two employees working side by side, one civilian and one military or naval, seeing the same waste, but only one person eligible to receive a cash award. The Committee on Armed Services concurs with us that this change is necessary. The people in the Federal work force are in the best position to discover fraud, abuse, waste, and mismanagement. Congress and every administration must encourage

its employees to operate as efficiently and economically as possible. This program is an excellent way to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 607 because it contributes to the efficiency of the Federal Government, rewards employees for saving taxpayers' money, and will help us keep the Federal budget under control.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

● Mr. WORTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 607, the Cash Savings Disclosure Awards Act.

Some of my colleagues might think it a bit odd that I speak in favor of reauthorizing the cash awards program for whistleblowers. After midnight in the final hours of the 98th Congress, I objected to an amended version of similar legislation.

Our brothers and sisters in the other body had taken a good bill, one that continued the awards program begun in 1981, and added an amendment that would have resulted in an expensive and chaotic mess if it had survived.

For those of you who might not remember, and for those who were not yet here, I will explain what happened.

The House bill was amended by adding language under the guise of protecting whistleblowers whose cases were turned down by the special counsel. Although laudable in intent, the proposed solution was a nightmare. The 1984 amendments would have given the whistleblower, who had been turned down by the special counsel, the right to appeal in a Federal district court.

What's wrong with that?

By itself, nothing. Except the would-be whistleblower would be represented by a Government attorney. At this stage, the Justice Department would have to represent the person against whom the allegations were made, the Merit System Protection Board would have to be there to defend the original decision, and a special counsel would have to be used to defend the employee.

Any way you look at it, that's three Federal entities at odds with each other, each purporting to represent the United States in a Federal district court.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has chosen to extend the cash awards program for the brave men and women who have called attention to dubious practices throughout the Federal bureaucracy.

There is no way we could adequately compensate them for their willingness to go out on a limb, in some instances, to make their findings public. However, cash awards show that their deeds

have not gone unrecognized save for a few paragraphs in a news story.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.●

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 607, the Cost Savings Disclosure Awards Extension Act. This important measure would continue the policy of rewarding Government employees who expose fraud and waste. These whistleblowers, sometimes harassed by their superiors because of their often embarrassing disclosures, deserve our full support. They are the often unsung heroes in the war for greater Government efficiency.

First instituted in 1979, the policy of providing small monetary incentives to encourage cost-saving disclosures lapsed at the end of 1984. But it has already proven its worth. The inspectors general of the Veterans' Administration, the Interior Department, and the Labor Department have provided \$6,100 in awards to employees whose disclosures have saved the Government—and thus the taxpayer—nearly \$1 million.

The inspectors general of these agencies, as well as that of the Defense Department, have responded favorably to this policy and have supported its extension as a valuable cost-saving tool.

A great deal of rhetoric is heard in this Chamber and across the country about cutting the fat out of the Federal bureaucracy. Here is one piece of legislation that can give some concrete meaning to that tough talk. I, for one, wholeheartedly support it.●

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 607, the Cost-Savings Disclosure Awards Extension Act. This important measure would once again grant authority to agencies to present awards to Federal employees who disclose waste, fraud, or mismanagement in the Government. Since this power expired in September of last year, the Government has been unable to give cash bonuses to those diligent Federal workers whose sharp eyes have helped reduce the national deficit.

I commend Representative SCHROEDER for reintroducing this bill. The Cost-Savings Disclosure Program, by all accounts, is a cost-effective Federal initiative. According to the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Civil Service, through October 1984, seven Federal employees had received awards totaling \$6,100 for disclosures that have saved over \$960,000. That's a rate of return of which we can all be proud.

This legislation should be quickly passed by the Congress, and signed into law. All Federal agencies should strive to make greater use of the program. But it is important to note that the bill before us today extends the disclosure awards to members of our

armed services—an extremely timely move, given the concern we all have for extracting greater efficiency from our defense spending.

Mr. Speaker, in this time of soaring Federal deficits, it is essential that we get maximum value for every dollar we spend. This legislation will help us achieve that critical goal. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this vital measure.●

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRAFICANT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 607.

The question was taken.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on both motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1096, by the yeas and nays, and H.R. 607, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1096.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1096, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 25, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—391

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews

Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins

AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman

Bates
Bedell
Bellenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Blaggi
Billrakis
Billie
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breau
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley

Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gooding
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack

MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCaIn
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer

Scheuer	Spratt	Vucanovich
Schneider	St Germain	Walgren
Schroeder	Staggers	Walker
Schuetz	Stallings	Watkins
Schulze	Stangeland	Waxman
Schumer	Stenholm	Weaver
Seiberling	Stokes	Weiss
Sensenbrenner	Strang	Wheat
Sharp	Stratton	Whitehurst
Shaw	Studds	Whitley
Shelby	Sundquist	Whittaker
Shumway	Swift	Whitten
Shuster	Synar	Williams
Sikorski	Tallon	Wilson
Siljander	Tauke	Wirth
Sisisky	Tauzin	Wise
Skeen	Taylor	Wolf
Skelton	Thomas (CA)	Wolpe
Slattery	Thomas (GA)	Wortley
Slaughter	Torres	Wright
Smith (FL)	Torricelli	Wyden
Smith (IA)	Towns	Wylie
Smith (NE)	Trafficant	Yates
Smith (NJ)	Traxler	Yatron
Smith, Robert	Udall	Young (AK)
Snowe	Valentine	Young (FL)
Snyder	Vander Jagt	Young (MO)
Solarz	Vento	Zschau
Solomon	Vislosky	
Spence	Volkmer	

NAYS—25

Archer	Craig	Rudd
Army	Dannemeyer	Smith (NH)
Badham	DeLay	Smith, Denny
Barton	Fields	Stump
Brown (CO)	Hall, Ralph	Sweeney
Cheney	Hansen	Swindall
Cobey	Kindness	Weber
Coble	Monson	
Combust	Nielson	

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Fascell	Lantos
Boehlert	Frenzel	Madigan
Boulter	Gray (IL)	Martin (IL)
Brooks	Hatcher	Stark
Crane	Holt	
Eckart (OH)	Kolter	

□ 1430

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:
Mr. ECKART of Ohio and Mr. LANTOS for, with Mr. CRANE against.

Mr. WEBER and Mr. RALPH M. HALL changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HEFNER and Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

COST SAVINGS DISCLOSURE AWARDS EXTENSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 607.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 607, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—413

Addabbo	Cooper	Gonzalez
Akaka	Coughlin	Goodling
Alexander	Courter	Gordon
Anderson	Coyne	Gradison
Andrews	Craig	Gray (PA)
Annunzio	Crockett	Green
Anthony	Daniel	Gregg
Applegate	Dannemeyer	Groberg
Archer	Darden	Guarini
Aspin	Daschle	Gunderson
Atkins	Daub	Hall (OH)
AuCoin	Davis	Hall, Ralph
Badham	de la Garza	Hall, Sam
Barnard	DeLay	Hamilton
Barnes	Dellums	Hammerschmidt
Bartlett	Derrick	Hansen
Barton	DeWine	Hartnett
Bateman	Dickinson	Hayes
Bates	Dicks	Hefner
Bedell	Dingell	Heftel
Bellenson	DioGuardi	Hendon
Bennett	Dixon	Henry
Bentley	Donnelly	Hertel
Bereuter	Dorgan (ND)	Hiller
Berman	Dornan (CA)	Hillis
Bevill	Dowdy	Hopkins
Biaggi	Downey	Horton
Blirakis	Dreier	Howard
Bliley	Duncan	Hoyer
Boggs	Durbin	Hubbard
Boland	Dwyer	Huckaby
Boner (TN)	Dymally	Hughes
Bonior (MI)	Dyson	Hunter
Bonker	Early	Hutto
Borski	Eckart (OH)	Hyde
Boucher	Eckert (NY)	Ireland
Boxer	Edgar	Jacobs
Breaux	Edwards (CA)	Jeffords
Brooks	Edwards (OK)	Jenkins
Broomfield	Emerson	Johnson
Brown (CA)	English	Jones (NC)
Brown (CO)	Erdreich	Jones (OK)
Broyhill	Evans (IA)	Jones (TN)
Bruce	Evans (IL)	Kanjorski
Bryant	Fawell	Kaptur
Burton (CA)	Fazio	Kasich
Burton (IN)	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Bustamante	Fiedler	Kemp
Byron	Fields	Kennelly
Callahan	Fish	Kildee
Campbell	Flippo	Kindness
Carney	Florio	Kiecicka
Carper	Foglietta	Kolbe
Carr	Foley	Kolter
Chandler	Ford (TN)	Kostmayer
Chappell	Fowler	Kramer
Chappelle	Frank	LaFalce
Chappie	Franklin	Lagomarsino
Cheney	Frost	Latta
Clay	Fuqua	Leach (IA)
Clinger	Gallo	Leath (TX)
Coats	Garcia	Lehman (CA)
Cobey	Gaydos	Lehman (FL)
Coble	Gejdenson	Lent
Coelho	Gekas	Levin (MI)
Coleman (MO)	Gephardt	Levine (CA)
Coleman (TX)	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Collins	Gillman	Lewis (FL)
Combust	Gingrich	Lightfoot
Conte	Glickman	Lipinski
Conyers		

Livingston	Packard	Snyder
Lloyd	Panetta	Solarz
Loeffler	Parris	Solomon
Lott	Pashayan	Spence
Lowery (CA)	Pease	Spratt
Lowry (WA)	Penny	St Germain
Lujan	Pepper	Staggers
Luken	Perkins	Stallings
Lundine	Petri	Stangeland
Lungren	Pickle	Stark
Mack	Porter	Stenholm
MacKay	Price	Stokes
Manton	Pursell	Strang
Markey	Quillen	Stratton
Marlenee	Rahall	Studds
Martin (NY)	Ray	Stump
Martinez	Regula	Sundquist
Matsul	Reid	Sweeney
Mavroules	Richardson	Swift
Mazzoli	Ridge	Swindall
McCain	Rinaldo	Synar
McCandless	Ritter	Tallon
McCollum	Roberts	Tauke
McCurdy	Robinson	Tauzin
McDade	Rodino	Taylor
McEwen	Roe	Thomas (CA)
McGrath	Roemer	Thomas (GA)
McHugh	Rogers	Torres
McKernan	Rose	Torricelli
McKinney	Rostenkowski	Towns
McMillan	Roth	Trafficant
Meyers	Roukema	Traxler
Mica	Rowland (CT)	Udall
Michel	Rowland (GA)	Valentine
Mikulski	Roybal	Vander Jagt
Miller (CA)	Rudd	Vento
Miller (OH)	Russo	Vislosky
Miller (WA)	Sabo	Volkmer
Mineta	Savage	Vucanovich
Mitchell	Saxton	Waigren
Moakley	Schaefer	Walker
Mollinari	Schneider	Watkins
Mollohan	Schroeder	Waxman
Monson	Schuette	Weaver
Montgomery	Schulze	Weber
Moody	Schumer	Weiss
Moore	Seiberling	Wheat
Moorhead	Sensenbrenner	Whitehurst
Morrison (CT)	Sharp	Whitley
Morrison (WA)	Shaw	Whittaker
Mrazek	Shelby	Whitten
Murphy	Shumway	Williams
Murtha	Shuster	Wilson
Myers	Sikorski	Wirth
Natcher	Siljander	Wise
Neal	Sisisky	Wolf
Nelson	Skeen	Wolpe
Nichols	Skelton	Wortley
Nielson	Slattery	Wright
Nowak	Slaughter	Wyden
O'Brien	Smith (FL)	Wylie
Oakar	Smith (IA)	Yates
Oberstar	Smith (NE)	Yatron
Obey	Smith (NH)	Young (AK)
Olin	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Ortiz	Smith, Denny	Young (MO)
Owens	Smith, Robert	Zschau
Oxley	Snowe	

NAYS—1

Army

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Lantos
Boehlert	Frenzel	Leland
Bosco	Gray (IL)	Madigan
Boulter	Hatcher	Martin (IL)
Crane	Hawkins	Rangel
Fascell	Holt	Scheuer

□ 1440

Mr. COBEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on the way to the floor and was here too late to be recorded on the bill, H.R. 1096.

I wish to have the RECORD show that had I been present, I would have voted aye on H.R. 1096.

□ 1450

WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY AT THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT ON FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1985

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the program of the wreath-laying ceremony at the Washington Monument on Friday, February 22, the birthday of George Washington, and the remarks of the two Members representing the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLAUGHTER], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], be inserted in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY: FEBRUARY 22, 1985

PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON 253RD BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY AND WASHINGTON MONUMENT 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEDICATION, WASHINGTON MONUMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

10:30 a.m.—Participants and Members of the Washington National Monument Society assemble in Monument waiting room.

11:00 a.m.—Presentation of Colors: Joint Armed Services Color Guard.

Welcome: Master of Ceremonies—Mr. Lowell V. Sturgill, Assistant Secretary, Washington National Monument Society.

Remarks: Mr. Russell E. Train, First Vice President, Washington National Monument Society.

Remarks: Mr. Manus J. Fish, Regional Director, National Capital Region, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Remarks: The Honorable D. French Slaughter, Jr., U.S. House of Representatives, Seventh District, Virginia.

Remarks: The Honorable Tommy Robinson, U.S. House of Representatives, Second District, Arkansas.

The wreath of the U.S. House of Representatives: Hon. D. French Slaughter, Jr., and Hon. Tommy Robinson.

The wreath of the Washington National Monument Society: Mr. Russell E. Train.

The wreath of the National Park Service: Mr. Manus J. Fish.

11:30 a.m.—Taps and retiring of colors.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE WASHINGTON

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to be among participants at ceremonies at the Washington Monument on February 22d, to pay tribute to the 253rd birthday of our country's first President, George Washington, as well as to mark the 100th anniversary of the Monument's dedication.

As I pointed out in informal remarks on that occasion, Washington's greatness made a great deal of difference to the future of our young country. It's hard to visualize what would have happened without his

strength, wisdom, experience and good judgment.

George Washington had numerous ties to Virginia's Seventh Congressional District that I am privileged to represent in the Congress. Part of his childhood was spent on a farm near Fredericksburg in Stafford County. He served as the first County Surveyor for Culpeper County. In a military capacity before and during the French and Indian War, he served western Virginia in the Shenandoah Valley around Winchester, and in western Pennsylvania. He served in the colonial legislature of Virginia, representing Frederick County.

His broad travel and his knowledge of the people in all sections of the Colonies provided him with more varied experience than virtually any other citizen of his time. No one knew the people of the Colonies so well as Washington did, and that knowledge, allied with his experience and his good judgment, helped to preserve our young country through a time when its independence was precarious.

In all of his great services to our country, Washington, to note his own words in other circumstances, raised a standard to which the "wise and honest can repair."

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN TOMMY F. ROBINSON AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY, FEBRUARY 22, 1985

It is with great pleasure that I join my distinguished colleague, Mr. Slaughter, and our distinguished guests to pay tribute and show again our respect for the man and the monument whose birthday and anniversary we celebrate today.

This monument whose 100th anniversary we acknowledge today, soars above the skyline of our nation's capital, drawing the eye of visitor and native alike, to focus our attention on George Washington. This nation has never been short on greatness. Whether we consider the contributions of those immigrants who brought their courage and strength to this land or we look to the accomplishments of our own native sons we find standing tall among the giants of our country's history—George Washington. As gentleman farmer, businessman, soldier and President, George Washington sought to serve an emerging nation. His high standards are the yardstick by which we measure public service and his deep love of country strikes a responsive cord within each American.

I understand that when the idea of a monument to George Washington was first proposed, the plans and drawings that were submitted for review ranged from the simple tribute we see today to opulent structures replete with columns and curlicues. Those intricate, overdone edifices were rejected for the clean, lean lines that serve as this city's focal point. I find this obelisk—whose color changes as the Maryland marble from which it is constructed plays with and reflects the day's light—a fitting monument for a man of simple, enduring ideals.

I am privileged to stand at the base of the monument to a great man which serves as both a physical landmark for this city and a spiritual landmark for this nation.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH F. MAINLAND

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, it is indeed an extreme pleasure to take time to honor one of the finest persons I have met in my lifetime, and a man whose record of public service is in the highest tradition of American patriotism.

I am referring to Keith Mainland, who serving in his role as the eighth clerk of the House Appropriations Committee, made the job of the members of the committee much easier to accomplish and less tedious.

There was never a time that Keith was not available to answer any and all questions for all members of this committee covering issues from agriculture to defense and with a very high degree of professionalism.

As you may know, Keith served as a first lieutenant in the USMC on active duty from September 1953 to July 1955, and I am proud to say as a colonel in the USMCR, he is a person with whom I would have been proud to serve.

Keith came to the Committee from the GSA, and learned much from a person who was a giant both physically and mentally, the Honorable Al Thomas of Texas.

Besides being a tremendous help to all of the members of the Committee, Keith is also a devoted husband to his wife, Sandra, and devoted father to his two children, Kirk, who attends George Mason University, and Marlene, his daughter, who is attending Georgia Tech on a basketball scholarship.

Keith will always be missed for his cheerful disposition, intelligence, and assistance. His devotion to the members of the Appropriations Committee, to the House of Representatives, and to our Nation, will be treasured and remembered always.

Members of Congress, I am proud to call as my friend, a great American and an individual I am proud to join in honoring, Keith Mainland.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for taking this special order on behalf of Keith Mainland, the retiring chief clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Keith is one of the unsung heroes of Government service. His efforts on behalf of the committee and hence the taxpayers of this country have saved billions of dollars, have contributed to the betterment of our country, and we all wish him well in his retirement.

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for having this special order in order

to recognize one of the outstanding leaders of this Congress who has been chief counsel for the Appropriations Committee for 10 these many years.

Mr. Speaker, Keith has done an outstanding job, is a perceptive and intelligent man. He deserves the highest accolades of this body, that of the Appropriations Committee and that of the people of this country for his dedication, hard work honesty, and decency.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Keith and wish him a happy, happy another 50 years.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for taking this time in order to give us an opportunity to pay tribute to the outstanding work of Keith F. Mainland.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Keith F. Mainland on his departure as the chief clerk and staff director of the House Committee on Appropriations. Mr. Mainland served proudly in the U.S. Marine Corps for 2 years on active duty and first entered civilian Government service in 1959. He was first appointed to the Appropriations Committee staff on March 1, 1962, and served on the committee staff in various positions until being selected to take the position of chief clerk and staff director in 1972. His retirement marks the conclusion of 28 years of honorable Government service with 23 of those years being served as a distinguished member of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations.

Keith is only the eighth person to serve as chief clerk of the Committee on Appropriations during its 120-year history.

Mr. Speaker, Keith has served the U.S. Government and the American people with distinction and is well deserving of the praise he is receiving here today. One of Keith's outstanding qualities is the capacity for just plain hard work. Keith has spent many long days, nights, and weekends at the Capitol under high pressure situations to complete the important budget work of the Congress. He has always displayed a high degree of professionalism under conditions that were frequently hectic.

He has exercised sound judgment in all situations and he exemplifies the ideal of a professional staff member, serving Members of both political parties with complete impartiality.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I want to thank Keith for his invaluable service to the Congress and to the United States and I wish him every happiness in the coming years.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Keith Mainland for his long and loyal service to the Appropriations Committee, to this House, and to the people of the United States. I have two special observations about the quality of his service.

First, the Committee on Appropriations has the finest staff in either body. I can say this without fear of contradiction or qualification. This fine support staff is due to Keith and several others on the committee who have, over the years, made a concerted and conscientious effort to recruit capable and highly motivated individuals to work for the committee and to ensure that they were trained to meet its needs. The public does not see the dedicated work of these individuals but the product of their efforts is the effective management of Federal programs with cost savings to the American taxpayer.

Second, Keith has been a cooperative and caring individual with whom to work for Members and our personal staff members. He is always attentive to our needs and eager to work with us to resolve our concerns.

Keith will be missed, but he deserves the thanks and appreciation of this House and his fellow countrymen for making the institutions of American democracy work to serve the people.

I wish Keith and his wife, Sandy, much happiness for many years to come and many pleasant and relaxing times fishing at their lakehouse.

Mr. MURTHA. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join this special order in honor of our friend, Keith Mainland. Keith has been chief clerk and staff director of the Committee on Appropriations since 1972, and is now retiring from Government service.

Keith has served his country well—first as a marine, who spent many months in the field in Korea, and then many years in civilian service to the Government at the General Services Administration and, for the last 23 years, with the committee.

Here is a man who exemplifies the best notion of what we call "public servant." He has been a tireless performer, and one who has been looked up to and respected by the professional staffs all over the Hill.

The members of the committee, the leadership, and many others throughout the House and Senate regularly consulted with Keith for his advice

and his perspective on appropriations matters.

His advice was always sincerely given—his perspective sound and objective. His leadership of an outstanding staff of peers is well known and highly praised.

Keith has always shown pride in his service to the House of Representatives—and he has somehow been able to balance that service with his love and concern for his lovely family: his wife, Sandy; and his two children, Kirk and Marlene.

We shall miss Keith. But we wish him much continued luck, success, and good health. And a nice, big bass every now and then.

□ 1500

KEITH F. MAINLAND

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I learned early on in my career as a legislator that a good staffer could be worth his weight in gold. And Keith Mainland, the recently retired clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, represented a good 170 pounds of pure gold.

I feel somewhat sorry for myself, Mr. Speaker, in that I am losing, in one sense, Keith's good counsel. When I joined the Appropriations Committee I spent a good bit of time with Keith. It was Keith and his staff as much as any Member of Congress who taught me the traditions, the rules, the nuances, and process of the Appropriations committee. I hope that Keith enjoyed educating me as much as I enjoyed learning. He has an incredible love for and appreciation of the appropriations process. He has a grasp of the history of the committee that is rivaled by only the chairman and some of the committee's senior members. He tolerated political posturing because he had to but he drove his staff and, in fact, influenced the members to regard the budgeting process as an extremely serious effort requiring hard work, close examination, healthy skepticism, and timely action.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Keith Mainland completely left the Marine Corps in 1955 because he certainly brought a lot of it with him into the Appropriations Committee. While the Appropriations Committee mark-ups are not exactly armed conflicts, Keith's Korean conflict experience had prepared him well for the rhetorical enemy, the jurisdictional disputes, and the jealous generals. It had also prepared him well to deal with green scouts such as myself.

First Lieutenant Mainland gave good counsel from the appropriations war room off the House floor. Keith worked at a large conference table in

the room which, at times, resembles the chapter room of a college fraternity. And if the Appropriations Committee has some fraternal and sororal aspects to it, then Keith was the staff equivalent of the fraternity president.

Keith, like a good marine, had little tolerance for those who did not attend to their duty. Consequently, he was constantly urging all of us to focus on the overall picture and I tough on the committee's associate staff whose concerns were sometimes not the more parochial. He once explained to one of my associate staffers that the associate staff was solely responsible for the Nation's deficit. While that comment can be written off as tounge-in-cheek exaggeration, it tells a lot about a man who dedicated his public life to his country—first to defend it, and later to help manage it in a fiscally responsible fashion. Keith Mainland is tough, he is a professional, he is fair, and he is everything that any chairman on this Hill would want in a staff director.

Keith also has an excellent capacity for putting things into perspective. While he was clearly one of the most powerful staffers on the Hill, few would even recognize him walking down the street. Despite his importance as a staffer, Keith handled himself with humility, respect, and a high degree of professionalism. I only had 3 years to benefit from Keith Mainland's good counsel. I envy those who have known him longer and regret that many of my colleagues did not get to know him. Most of all, I thank him for his unselfish and dedicated service to this country and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues to express my sincere thanks to Keith Mainland on his retirement. Keith has served the Committee on Appropriations for 22 years and has been the clerk and staff director since October 1972.

During my first term as a Member of Congress, I had the good fortune of being elected to the Committee on Appropriations, and I found Keith to be very helpful. He knows the rules and parliamentary procedures of the House probably better than any other staff person on the Hill, and he was always available to offer counsel and advice. There is no question that during his tenure with the committee he has demonstrated his valuable reservoir of competence and experience. I'm sure that many of his finest qualities were learned during his service with the Marine Corps where he was a first lieutenant at the time of his discharge.

If there are two words to describe Keith, they are "service" and "loyal-

ty." This truly applies to Keith who is known for his unquestioned loyalty to the chairman and the committee.

Keith, I want to wish you happiness, success and good health in your retirement. You can be proud of your career with the committee, and we share that pride with you.

BIOGRAPHY OF KEITH F. MAINLAND

Eighth Clerk of the Committee since its establishment in 1865.

Born Elgin, Illinois, January 14, 1932.

Part-time work for A&P from July 1948 to August 1949.

Graduated from Washington-Lee High School in Arlington, VA—1949.

Graduated from Northwestern University with BA in Business Administration—June 1953.

Marine Corps—enlisted in reserves in March 1951.

Commissioned 2nd Lieutenant in July 1953—discharged as 1st Lieutenant in July 1955.

Sales representative for Proctor and Gamble, Jan. 1956-1958.

GSA budget analyst Oct. 1958 to 1962 when he was detailed to Committee on January 22, 1962.

Appointed to Committee staff March 1, 1962 by Chairman Clarence Cannon of Missouri, and served with what is now the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee under Chairman Al Thomas of Texas.

Appointed Clerk of the Committee by Chairman George Mahon of Texas in October 1972.

Married to the former Sandra (Sandy) Wadlow; has two children: Kirk, who attends George Mason University; Marlene, who attends Georgia Tech on a basketball scholarship.

Has maintained a vacation home on Lake Louisa in Central Virginia, where he may be expected to be found with increasing regularity fishing and enjoying life.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LOEFFLER].

Mr. LOEFFLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor—and some regret—that I rise today to pay tribute to Keith Mainland, chief clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations, on the occasion of his retirement.

Keith is truly one of our own—and one of the finest public servants in the history of the House Appropriations Committee and of this body. He was appointed to the committee staff in 1962 by Chairman Cannon and elevated to the position of chief clerk by my Texas colleague, George Mahon, in October 1972. We are sorry to see Keith retire, but take some comfort that his position is being filled by Fred Mohrman, a veteran of the Appropriations Committee and a man cut from the Mainland cloth.

I have known and worked with Keith Mainland since 1972 in a slightly different context than most of the other members of the Appropriations Committee—first as a member of a legislative team in the other body, as Deputy for Congressional Affairs at

the Federal Energy Administration and as Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs under President Gerald Ford. While Keith and I did not always see eye to eye on the issues, I can personally attest to the fact that he is a top-notch professional, an honorable man, and a noble adversary.

Keith will sorely be missed by the members of the Appropriations Committee and by the Members of the House. We wish him well as he retires to his home and family in rural Virginia. He is a man who has served this House well and a man who I am proud to call colleague and friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman in accolades for Keith Mainland as he retires from the Congress. He has done a great job across-the-board, across partisan lines in serving the committee, serving this Congress. His wisdom has been appreciated by all who have been connected with the committee or with him. I personally appreciate his willingness to respond to requests on an even-handed scale and weight.

I wish him every good fortune in his future.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say I did not have the opportunity to know Keith Mainland for too many years since I was able to serve on the Appropriations Committee for the last 4. But I have always been impressed with his untiring effort to do a job for the committee.

I think my friend from Maryland stated it correctly. Many of us cannot do the job here without adequate and very qualified professional staff. Keith Mainland is a true example of being a professional. He has dedicated his life basically trying to be of service here in the Congress. On many occasions, on late hours, all night long, Keith Mainland and members of his staff were working trying to meet deadlines, trying to meet the concerns and the needs of Members of the Congress in order to try to provide what most of us felt like were the demands and concerns of our constituents across America.

This is truly a day that we can salute and pay tribute to Keith Mainland for his outstanding contribution not only to this Congress, but to the citizens across the United States.

● Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in congratulating Mr. Keith Mainland on his retirement, and in lamenting the loss of the outstanding staff director of the Appropriations Committee.

I have known Mr. Mainland for just 2 years. But this has been more than enough time to see firsthand his dedication, his profound depth of knowledge, and his astute good sense—all of which have made him invaluable to the committee over the years.

Mr. Mainland has represented the finest qualities in a staff member, lending his rare expertise and dedication to the service of his country.

I congratulate him on his retirement and would like to join with my colleagues in thanking him for his years of invaluable service.●

● Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in honoring Keith Mainland on the occasion of his retirement as clerk of our committee.

There is no doubt that Keith will be sorely missed by all of us on both sides of the aisle. He was always fair, courteous, and helpful. He never sought the limelight, but worked diligently behind the scenes to facilitate the work of our committee. In times of pressure and stress, in late-night sessions and weekend conferences, throughout the turmoil, Keith remained calm, collected, competent, friendly, and reliable.

Keith first joined the Appropriations Committee staff in March 1962, and served for approximately 10½ years on the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee before being appointed clerk of the committee by Chairman George Mahon in October 1972. Therefore his total service on our committee totals 23 years.

It is perhaps understandable that, after this period of time, Keith is now interested in moving on to something else. But this does not alter the fact that we regret his departure. Keith has been a true public servant in the highest sense of that term. Representative government simply cannot work without the dedicated services of staffers like Keith Mainland. We thank him for his contribution to our committee, to the House of Representatives as a whole, and to the Nation. We wish him well for the future.●

● Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with my colleagues in the House to honor our good friend, Keith Mainland, upon his retirement from a most successful career of government service.

As clerk of the Appropriations Committee since 1972, Keith has managed this committee during its most difficult times. Yet, through his insight into the budget process, his skill at management, and his many significant contributions to the institution of the House of Representatives, Keith has provided most able leadership to this important committee.

Keith has earned the respect of the Members and staff of the entire House. His reputation for excellence and his dedication to our Nation place

him at the forefront of those who serve the citizens of America.

I personally want to thank Keith Mainland for his untiring and unflinching assistance. As a subcommittee chairman, I have often called on Keith and he has been a continual source of sage advice and counsel. I shall always be grateful to him.

I wish Keith happiness and good health in his well deserved retirement.●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Keith Mainland has one of the most difficult and demanding jobs in this city. He is about to retire and I am delighted that we are taking a moment today to honor him.

Keith has many, many friends from both parties on both sides of the Capitol Building and I am proud to say that I am one of them. I remember Keith Mainland from his earliest days when he joined the Appropriations Committee as a staff member of the Housing Subcommittee. In all those years he had been the very personification of professionalism and excellence. As a clerk of the full committee for the past 12 years, Keith has handled the complexities and enormous responsibilities that the job involves with a grace and efficiency that are nothing less than remarkable. His contributions to the legislative process are as solid and genuine as anything can be and I can tell you that every Member of this House is in his debt.

I will miss him, the committee will miss him, and the Congress will miss him, and I want him to know that I wish him a happy, successful, and productive retirement.●

● Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in saluting Keith Mainland as he retires as the eighth clerk of the Committee on Appropriations. As a member of that committee, I have known Keith and worked with him for his entire tenure as clerk and it has been a very special honor and privilege to be associated with him.

Keith was a student of and a product of this institution. He knows and loves the Hill. Its people. More than most. Sure, he knew the Speaker, the minority leader, the leaders of both parties. But, he also knew the elevator operators and the officers on duty in the wee hours of the morning. Somehow, for example, Keith knew that a certain Rayburn Building policeman would appreciate reading an obscure book, written in Italian, which I had received as a gift.

Although Keith had more seniority on Capitol Hill than most of us, he always rose out of respect when any Member of Congress entered his office and he always referred to Members as "Mr." or "Mrs." and this was not an affectation. It was the result of many years of training and belief in the old school ways.

Although the power brokers in our Nation's Capital frequently sought his advice, Keith was even more flattered when his fishing buddies would ask for directions to the best fishing hole in Lake Louisa.

Keith, once and always a marine, worked behind the lines. He was always uncomfortable to find himself quoted or his name in print. Keith never had his own agenda. He only wanted to ensure that Members' decisions were implemented as quickly and as effectively as possible.

Keith wanted the trains to run on time. But, he also wanted them to arrive with the cargo intact. At the same time, he thrived on what the rest of us might call chaos and made sense of it.

Aufwiedersehen, Keith. Thanks to you—our trains are still on track.●

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I and my colleagues say farewell to the public service of Keith Mainland, who is retiring from his position as the eighth clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Keith was always on call from both sides of the aisle. He never seemed to be quite finished with committee business. He was never too busy to listen and respond to every request—trivial or substantive.

I remember well in the last few years when the budget process was under such siege working with Keith Mainland, gaunt and red-eyed with fatigue. He could always hear us over the hubbub of full committee. He always had time to guide me and my staff through the thickets of the appropriations legislative process. He never failed to appropriately communicate my wishes and concerns, faithfully, swiftly, and accurately, to the chairman and to my colleagues. In fact, he often anticipated my requests and addressed them adequately and with consideration, always, for the feelings of others.

On Capitol Hill, it is often said that congressional staff should not even be seen—let alone heard. Keith Mainland was capable of almost total invisibility. The important thing was that he made himself known through his service to the committee, the committee, and the committee—regardless of rank or seniority of individual members who sought his advice and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I find it astonishing that Keith Mainland survived in his demanding position as clerk for more than 12 years, rising to that rank after 11 previous years on the committee staff.

I suspect that, with the pace in Congress accelerating, his worthy, astute, and knowledgeable successor, Frederick G. Mohrman, will be under increasing burn-out pressure. I note, however, that Mr. Mohrman has been on the

committee staff for more than 10 years already, and so perhaps he too has learned to cope with the personalities and foibles of the committee's able and distinguished members.

So to Fred Mohrman, I also extend my best wishes as he embarks upon his new responsibilities—or perhaps, it should be condolences as he faces the inevitable firestorms of controversies certain to sweep our committee.

Keith Mainland met such turmoil with patience, imperturbable calm, competence, conscientiousness, meticulousness, and good humor. His was an example of giant proportions, testimony to the fact that excellence is attainable under even often the most difficult circumstances.

Keith Mainland, a native of Illinois, reportedly will be found with increasing regularity at his home on Lake Louisa in central Virginia. I sincerely hope that with his long, long, often irregular hours, his family will realize how much his committee will miss him as he takes up this opportunity for fuller participation as a more private person. Truly, Illinois' loss was the committee's gain—until now.

I extend all best wishes to Keith, to his wife, Sandra, and their two college-student offspring, Kirk and Marlene.●

● Mr. BONER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee in commemorating the retirement of Keith Mainland, our committee clerk.

Though I have been a member of the committee for only a brief time, I have come to appreciate the fine work that Keith performed for the committee. His guidance, as well as patience, helped me become familiar with the committee's procedures and the budget's intricacies.

Keith's counsel and expertise will be missed by the committee. Based on my own observations, as well as the stories I have heard from other members of the committee, it is clear that Keith demonstrated the dedication and professionalism that was characteristic of the clerks who preceded him. Keith filled the large shoes left by his predecessors. He leaves even larger shoes behind for all those who succeed him.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee in bidding Keith farewell. I join them in wishing Keith and his family the very best upon his retirement from the committee.●

● Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Keith Mainland, only the eighth clerk of the House Appropriations Committee since it was established in 1865, is retiring and moving on to a new career.

As a minority member of the committee, I can say with all sincerity Keith dealt with minority members fairly, and he responded to our concerns and needs on every occasion. An historically bipartisan committee, the

House Appropriations Committee over the years has always had a thoroughly professional staff that serves both the majority and minority in excellent fashion. Since joining the committee in 1980, it has been a pleasure for me to work with good people like Keith and the staff people on the various subcommittees. Keith and his colleagues have always made my work here in Congress much easier, and they have been an integral part in helping me fulfill my duties to the citizens of the First Congressional District and the entire State of Louisiana.

Keith, thank you. We will miss you, but we know that you have left us in good hands. Good luck.●

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee in saluting the committee's retiring clerk and staff director, Keith Mainland. Keith is retiring after serving the committee—and this Congress—for 23 years.

Those of us who have had an opportunity to work with Keith have come to value his experience and judgment. As the committee's eighth clerk since its establishment in 1865, Keith has labored over details and technicalities that few others understand. During the 5 years that I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Appropriations I have come to respect Keith's mastery of the rules of the House and his loyalty to the committee.

Keith has been clerk since 1972, during a watershed period of the committee's history. As the Members are aware, the Budget Impoundment and Control Act of 1974 altered the committee's responsibilities and the entire appropriations process. Keith has provided leadership in defining the committee's new responsibilities and fulfilling the mandate of the 1974 act.

It should also be noted that the committee is unique among others in this House because the staff functions as a professional staff—in a bipartisan manner. As clerk, Keith has maintained this enviable tradition.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that Keith intends to spend his newfound time with his family at their home on Lake Louisa in Virginia. I want to thank Keith for his service to the committee, and to wish him every happiness in retirement.●

● Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues of the House Appropriations Committee in paying special tribute to Keith Mainland, who is retiring after many years of dedicated service as chief clerk and staff director of the Appropriations Committee. I extend my personal appreciation to Keith for his kind assistance to me, and to congratulate him for his outstanding contributions to the work of the committee. We shall miss him and his wealth of knowledge and expertise.

Prior to his career with the committee, the 1953 Northwestern University graduate served as a 1st lieutenant with the Marines, worked in private industry and for the General Services Administration. Keith came to this committee in 1962, working for the late Albert Thomas of the HUD Subcommittee. He then worked 6 years for Chairman George Mahon, and in 1972 was appointed to his present position. Wherever he goes, Keith exhibits a special talent for organization and excellence—always striving to achieve these goals before moving to his next challenge.

While those of us who have had the privilege and pleasure of knowing Keith and working with him for the past several years regret his leaving, nevertheless, we extend to him and his wife Sandra best wishes for all future endeavors. We hope they will have many years of excellent health, great happiness, and good fortune, combined with a full measure of leisure-time activities.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

DEBATE SHOULD BE LIMITED TO ISSUES ONLY

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I noticed something rather interesting in the last several days here in the House of Representatives. It appears as though when Members of the minority side attempt to raise issues from time to time that they are then immediately subjected to personal attack of some sort with regard to the issues that they raise.

It happened the other day when I raised the issue of whether or not we were going to count calendar days or legislative days with regard to the 45-day limit on Mr. McIntyre that the House Administrative Committee is supposed to have.

At that point the issue was turned by the majority leader to the issue of whether or not the minority attempting to schedule additional legislative days whether or not that would not cost the taxpayers additional money.

Therefore, it then became an issue of whether or not by raising this question whether or not I was not trying to cost the taxpayers money.

I think the American people need to know the facts, which of course I did not have the facts and figures before me.

The fact is that the minority has yet to schedule a pro forma session in this session of Congress. I have figured that the majority, particularly the majority leader, has thus far scheduled 11 pro forma sessions in this session of Congress.

Now, therefore, if it is correct that those are costing the taxpayers large amounts of money, it is the majority that is at this point costing the taxpayers thousands upon thousands of dollars with these pro forma sessions.

I also was interested to try to find out exactly where they came up with the figures that the majority leader was talking about on the floor. Much to my dismay after I requested those figures I still have not received them. That was last week. It has almost been 1 week. They had a piece of paper out on the floor that he was referring to on the figures, and yet, the Clerk of the House cannot supply those figures to this gentleman.

My suggestion is that those may be partisanly derived figures rather than real figures that were being used.

Nevertheless, it is an interesting technique that raise an issue and be subjected to personal attack.

Then, yesterday, I must admit I was not here yesterday. I missed the Journal vote. It was a definite difference in my career not to be here for a Journal vote, but I was at home and I watched the proceeding on C-Span and I found another very interesting personal attack launched on my colleague from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. At that point he was told that if you do not vote on an issue at some point you therefore have no business speaking on that issue.

Well, I find that a very interesting standard that we are going to exact. I went and I got a printout of the Member who made that accusation of how many votes that particular Member missed in the last session of Congress. This is a printout of all of those votes missed in the last session of Congress.

I would suggest that if that Member is going to hold that standard that there were an awful lot of issues that that Member was not able to speak on in the last session of Congress.

So, I would think that perhaps that is a personal attack we would want to be a little careful about in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will get around this idea when issues are raised launching personal attacks on Members on Congress. It might be better to just discuss the issues.

□ 1510

THE PROBLEMS WITH IMPORT SURCHARGES

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

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been some interest in the private sector, and here in the Congress, in a temporary import surcharge to help bring our trade deficit down. Supposedly, this would eliminate some of the advantages imports are receiving in the U.S. market caused by the strength of the U.S. dollar.

An import surcharge sounds tempting—an easy way to solve the trade deficit. However, easy solutions are not always good solutions. While an import surcharge may have a short-term effect on the trade deficit, all evidence indicates that there would be more harm to U.S. exports than assistance.

While an import surcharge may not be GATT illegal, it is true that most countries have been reluctant to impose them due to possible adverse GATT implications.

Many economists believe that the dollar will simply readjust itself upward thus leaving the surcharge meaningless. In addition, we face similar retaliation surcharges imposed by our trading partners. Then EC has already indicated that it is ready to impose a surcharge equal to ours.

As Trade Ambassador Bill Brock said recently in an interview, "The problem with surcharge is that it doesn't deal with the underlying causes of our difficulties * * *. It may alleviate the pain, but it doesn't eliminate the illness * * * the fact is that a surcharge * * * would do great harm to our exports."

The import surcharge imposed by President Nixon in 1971 lasted about 3 months. There is no evidence that this one would be more successful. Let's follow the advice of the experts and look for more positive ways to reduce the trade deficit. ●

TAXING VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION WOULD BE UNJUST

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

● Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that Veterans' Administration service-connected disability compensation payments should remain exempt from Federal income taxation.

I am greatly concerned, as are all veterans, about a proposal now being

seriously considered by the administration which would require veterans who receive compensation for service-connected injuries to pay Federal income tax on those benefits.

This proposal is part of the tax simplification plan submitted to the President by former Treasury Secretary Donald Regan. The taxing of compensation benefits has nothing to do with tax simplification.

Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my opposition to such a proposal, and I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I do so.

These disabled veterans earned their benefits by serving honorably in our military and by suffering wounds and injuries during that service. It would be unjust to ask our veterans with service-connected disabilities to give up any portion of their current benefits. During a joint hearing before the House and Senate Committees on Veterans' Affairs this morning this issue was thoroughly discussed and it is obvious to me the taxing of compensation is absolutely unacceptable and the President had might as well forget it.

There follows a copy of my letter to the President regarding this matter and a copy of the letter Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT and I recently sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. James Baker:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 9, 1985.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have read with great interest and considerable misgivings Secretary Regan's proposal to tax service-connected veterans' compensation. These benefits have from their inception been exempted from taxation, and I cannot imagine any justification that would warrant a departure from this long-standing policy.

Veterans compensation is designed to replace lost earning capacity attributable to disability. Since the benefit has traditionally been tax exempt, the rates reflect this status. For example, the rate for a single veteran who is totally disabled is only \$15,540 per year. The difference between this rate and the average earnings of wage earners today reflects the tax exempt status of compensation benefits. To use the language of Treasury policy analysts, the present rates are calculated on a "net replace" basis. If the benefit were to be taxed, we in the Congress would have to raise the rates to their average earning loss equivalent. This action would probably more than offset the increased taxes to be realized.

Consider also that in addition to a proposed tax on the benefit, it has been proposed to deny a COLA in FY 1986. Taken together, the effect of these two policies is a double penalty imposed on some of our most deserving citizens, those who suffered grievous loss in the service of our country. It is indeed ironic that some of our most deserving citizens should have to bear an unjustly heavy tax burden.

The Congress has long recognized that changes in the structure of the labor market also change the effects that various

disability levels have on earning capacity. We have adjusted to this by making the compensation rates incremental rather than straight line. For example, the rate for a 10% disability (\$66 per month) is only 5% of the rate for total disability and the rate for 90% (\$779 per month) is only 60% of the total rate. The proposed tax credit of 15% on up to \$6,000 of compensation for an individual is much more beneficial to the less disabled veteran than to those with more profound disability. Not only is this grossly unfair, but it also flies in the face of what we have been trying to do with the rate structure.

Armed services retirees who also have service-connected disabilities are precluded by law from drawing retirement and compensation concurrently. Instead, they must waive so much of their retirement pay as equals compensation. They do this only because compensation is not taxable and retirement based on length of service is. These retirees have continued to pressure this Committee for costly legislation that removes the prohibition against dual payments. With your proposal vitiating the benefit they receive by waiving retirement pay to receive compensation, the pressure on this Committee to permit receipt of both compensation and retired pay would be greatly increased.

I have tentatively scheduled a full Committee hearing on February 20, 1985 to hear from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the VA budget. In view of the adverse impact the taxing of compensation would have on service-connected disabled veterans, we must hear Secretary Regan's justification for his recommendation to you, and I will insist that he or his spokesman appear before the Committee on that date to present the Administration's views and to answer questions relating to the proposal.

In order to prepare for that hearing, please have Secretary Regan provide answers to the following questions:

1. Would all Federal payments based on disability be taxed; e.g. disability benefits from social security, military retirement, Federal employees compensation, damage awards that are paid as compensation for civilian injury or death, etc.? If there are any exclusions, what is the rationale for the exclusion?

2. What is the estimated revenue to be realized from taxing compensation?

3. Please provide me with examples of how Secretary Regan's proposal and his tax credit would apply to veterans receiving each of the rates for the disabilities specified in title 38, U.S.C. 314 (a) through (s)?

4. VA compensation is based on "average impairments of earning capacity resulting from such injuries in civil occupations" so there is no penalty for overcoming the handicap of a disability. Thus, many totally disabled veterans have overcome their handicaps, returned to productive employment and pay taxes on their earnings. Have any efforts been made to calculate the tax loss attributable to the disincentive effect of your proposal on such veterans?

5. In addition to the basic percentage of disability rates, the law also provides special rates for veterans with special needs. For example, title 38, U.S.C. 314 (l) and (r) pay special rates based on disabilities so profound they require the aid and attendance of another person. Does Secretary Regan's proposal contemplate a deduction for the amounts actually expended for this purpose?

Mr. President, I trust you will not favorably consider this recommendation when

you submit your budget to the Congress early next month.

Sincerely,

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 7, 1985.

HON. JAMES A. BAKER III,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed are copies of letters recently sent to the President expressing our views on a provision of the tax reform measure proposed by former Secretary Regan concerning taxation of compensation paid to service-connected veterans. Following your confirmation by the Senate, we were informed by your staff that you would be reviewing the tax reform proposal. It has been suggested that pending such review and your recommendations to the President, it would be premature to hear from the Treasury Department during our hearings on February 20 and 21. We agree.

We understand your desire to review in detail the tax reform package submitted by the former Secretary and, in that regard, will not insist that Treasury officials testify at our hearings; however, all of our members are anxious to know your views in reference to whether the compensation received by service-connected disabled veterans should be subject to Federal taxation. You can appreciate the many calls being received by members of both the House and Senate on this issue since it has been highly publicized by all the national veterans service organizations.

It would be most helpful to those of us who serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee to know your views on this aspect of the tax reform package. During his State of the Union address Wednesday evening, the President said: "One thing that tax reform will not be is a tax increase in disguise. We will not jeopardize the mortgage-interest deduction that families need." Mr. Secretary, the taxing of compensation is a tax increase for the most deserving of our citizens and surely you and the President would not want to jeopardize the income provided them for their loss of earning capacity due to disabilities incurred in military service.

We are advised by the Ways and Means Committee that the Chairman has scheduled a hearing on February 27 to hear from you in reference to tax reform. We would like to have your views on the veterans tax issue by such date.

Sincerely,

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY,
Chairman.

JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
Ranking Minority Member. ●

REAGAN BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR EDUCATION

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in discussing the impact of the Reagan administration's budget proposals and policies on the American commitment to education.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that we must take time today to counterattacks on one of America's

most prized commitments—its commitment to education. Two hundred years ago our Nation established the principle that a basic education for every person is both a public good and an individual right. Since that time, the Federal role in education has been significant and successful in meeting the needs of our young people, particularly the disadvantaged.

Now, in 1985, the Reagan administration is out to change that success and commitment. The President's recommended budget cuts in the various elementary and secondary programs, as well as the higher education programs, not only show a lack of vision and foresight, they also show a callous disregard for the dreams and aspirations of millions of poor and disadvantaged children and young adults.

For example, between fiscal year 1980 and fiscal year 1984, the elementary and secondary education budget suffered an after-inflation cut of 22 percent. Now that those elementary and secondary programs have been gutted, the administration proposes to freeze them at current levels which is in fact, another reduction when inflation is added in. Postsecondary education is under a similar attack. Current administration budget proposals, if they were to be accepted, would result in 1 million fewer students receiving Federal financial aid.

I find it very ironic that the administration, on the one hand, can speak so highly of the benefits of a good education, and on the other hand, make every attempt to deny that benefit to those who need it most—the poor and disadvantaged.

There is no denying that the direction of Government policy is also an important determinant of who gains and who loses in our society. The Reagan agenda on this point is quite clear to many Members of this body—it should be a clear message to the American public as well—if you are economically sound, don't worry—if you are poor or just making ends meet, forget a quality education. It's an agenda that clearly benefits the rich, while penalizing the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided thinking. More than 35 million people in this country live in poverty. They lack sufficient income and resources to provide adequate food, shelter, and health care for themselves and their families. Without a concerted effort to oppose the disproportionate Reagan budget reductions in education, those Americans who have fallen through the so-called safety net into the depths of poverty, will not even have a chance to climb back into the mainstream of society.

THE RADIATION RESEARCH REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1985

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

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of this century, government has recognized that one of its most important functions is ensuring the safety of our Nation's workers. Substantial progress has been made since the days of Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" in providing a safer and healthier work environment. No longer are manufacturing plants dens of torture. No longer do we turn our backs on the black lung and brown lung plight facing our miners. Our Nation can be proud of the progress that has been made in providing a healthy work environment, although further efforts are necessary in many industries.

The nuclear industry faces a different situation. There are approximately 80,000 men and women employed in nuclear facilities across the country. Since the early tests of nuclear weapons, there has been disagreement and controversy over the health hazards posed by heavy radiation exposure. Because of this uncertainty, efforts have been made to ensure the safety of workers through regulation and safety precautions. At the same time, research has been encouraged to determine the magnitude of the health hazards facing workers. It is imperative that this research be done in the most objective and unbiased manner possible. Yet, the Federal agency performing the bulk of this research is the same agency which has responsibility for operating and promoting nuclear weapons facilities: the Department of Energy. This is akin to allowing the plant manager in the meat-packing plant in "The Jungle" to determine what is safest for the plant's workers.

The Department of Energy is currently responsible for approximately 60 percent of the Federal research into the health effects of radiation. At the same time, this agency operates and maintains our nuclear production facilities. This conflict of interest casts doubt upon the objectivity of the Department's research and on its interest in worker safety and health.

Research into the health effects of radiation must be continued. We must not relent in the search for answers. However, it is critical that this research be conducted objectively, in a manner in which workers and the public can place the highest confidence. Some in the scientific community have questioned the conclusions of DOE's research; others have supported them. This legislation does not pass judgment on the validity of the Department's work. Instead, the issue is whether the workers and the indus-

try can have confidence in this research. No Federal agency which manages the facilities it studies can meet this concern.

For this reason, I am introducing legislation to transfer the authority for these studies from the Department of Energy to the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS]. There are several reasons why HHS makes a better choice. It makes more sense to have health research conducted by an agency responsible for health issues, not one responsible for operating energy and defense programs. Moreover, HHS and several agencies within the Department have already been involved in research into the health effects of radiation. These include the National Cancer Institute, the Center for Devices and Radiological Health in the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, and the Centers for Disease Control. The Secretary of HHS, under this legislation, would consult with the heads of all of these agencies in conducting this research. Finally, an advisory panel would be established to provide advice and assistance in conducting this research.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is long overdue. There have been numerous attempts in recent years to shift research responsibility from DOE to public health agencies, but we always seem to end up where we started, with DOE performing most of the work and public health agencies performing very little. Task forces and advisory panels have been created, but they are short lived. Congress must enact legislation specifically mandating the transfer of this function. It is my hope that it will not take a disaster like one which occurred at the Sunshine Silver mine before this action is taken. Prior to that tragedy, responsibility for miners' safety and health lay with the Department of the Interior, the same agency responsible for promoting coal production. Only after more than 90 people were killed did Congress realize that you can't have both worker safety and production under the same leadership and transferred mine safety and health out of the Department of the Interior. Let us act now before a similar disaster occurs in the nuclear weapons industry.

TULSA, OK: STILL NO. 1

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

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to clear up for my colleagues a false report about my home city which, unfortunately, received national attention. Due to a

keypunch error, as well as possible factual mistakes in compiling air quality statistics, a Cleveland State University study on the livability of American cities ranked Tulsa last in two categories: Economic welfare of minorities and quality of community life.

The study could not have been farther from the truth, in those areas or any others. In fact, according to a study by the Joint Economic Committee, Tulsa is the most financially sound city in the Nation. That study, entitled "Urban America 1984: A Report Card," measures the economic opportunity of Americans living in cities over 250,000. It concludes that all Tulsans, including minorities, live in the best economic atmosphere in America.

The Joint Economic Committee findings come as no surprise. In August 1979, the Futurist magazine rated Tulsa as the city where urban distress is the lowest in the United States. Harper's magazine's survey of livability ranked Tulsa second in the United States, and a subsequent update by the University of Nebraska showed Tulsa to be America's most livable city.

I ask my colleagues how America's most livable city could be the worst for minorities or those people looking for high quality community life. The answer is, of course, that Tulsa is not the worst. While Cleveland State University has acknowledged its mistake, indignant Tulsans from the business and political communities have joined together as plaintiffs in a lawsuit to recover damages from the university and the study's author. At a time when we were pursuing every possible economic development angle to continue the economic diversification of Tulsa, a front-page story in the daily paper USA Today had a very negative impact on those efforts. That story, of course, reprinted the inaccuracies of the study, and was distributed throughout the country.

What I have found, Mr. Speaker, is that these studies do have a profound impact on the outside perception of a city. We Tulsans are most fortunate that other studies, from unimpeachable sources, have showed Tulsa to be the No. 1 American city, and America's most livable city, and that we have business and political leaders in our city who will defend its good name against false studies such as that by Cleveland State University.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have asked for this special order because we wish to dis-

cuss for an hour this afternoon the importance of education in America and the effect of the President's proposed budget on our American system of education and on our children and adults who are so reliant upon excellence in the schools.

Two thousand years ago, Aristotle said the neglect of education ruins the constitution of the nation.

Twenty centuries later, Thomas Jefferson, writing to a friend, wrote this:

To believe that a people can be both ignorant and free is to expect what never was or never will be.

And in writing to another friend on a different day, he said, in discussing important legislation to come before the National Legislature:

I know of no bill more important than that for the diffusion of knowledge among our people.

And so it was that the importance of education was present at the birth of democracy and present again 2,000 years later at the birth of our democratic Republic.

The budget process affects education, and because it affects education, particularly that portion of the budget that is used to properly fund our schools and to properly level the playing fields, as it were, so that all Americans have access on an equal basis to those schools, the importance of the budget to that process is vital, and it is vital, in my opinion, for this reason: If this experiment of ours in this Nation is to work, that is, if we are to rule ourselves and do it better than any king or any prince that ever ruled, then we must be the best educated people not of this time but of all time.

The American people have had a visceral understanding for more than 200 years now of the importance of that, and so it is that we wish to discuss some, among ourselves and with you, about how the President's budget would affect education in this country.

To put it in proper perspective, let me refer to the chart that is here to my right. The top green spot is a replication, of sorts, of a dollar, and it is broken down into various expenditures of that Federal dollar for the year 1980. The bottom is a replica of a dollar, broken into the way the President would have us spend money under this year's proposed budget, that is, for the coming fiscal year.

Let me quickly go through how a dollar is divided. What do we do with your tax dollars; how do we divide them? Well, we spend 29 cents of each dollar for defense; 15 cents of each dollar is spent just to pay the interest on the money that we borrow, 28 cents of each dollar is spent for Social Security, including Medicare; 1 cent of each dollar is spent for our farmers—1 cent. You have heard a lot about it in the news. It is 1 cent out of each dollar. One cent is spent for community development programs; 2 cents out

of each dollar is spent for foreign aid; 4 cents out of each dollar for health, that is, each dollar spent by the Federal Government, 5 cents for retirement and disability, and, my friends, for education the Federal Government out of each dollar spends 2 cents—2 cents—2 cents not to lift the quality of education in America, for your National Legislature has always left, with very few exceptions, the lifting of the quality of our schools to the State and local governments. This Congress, both House and Senate, and each President has only been involved in education to the extent that we provide equity and access to the Nation's schools. The Federal Government does not spend this 2 cents out of each dollar to lift the quality of the teaching of our people, only to assure that those people, be they handicapped or not, be they rich or poor, be they black or brown or red or yellow or white, all have an equal opportunity, young and old, to share in this great system of education.

□ 1520

Now, in my judgment, and the judgment of many of my colleagues, the President's budget moves toward shattering, moves toward disassembling this long tradition of partnership between the State governments, the local governments, the local school board and the Federal Government.

Let me deal quickly with just three of them. Sometimes we do not think of child abuse as a matter of education, but it is. An abused child does not do very well in the classrooms, as we all know. We consider it education spending. The President recommends a cut in funding for the efforts to stop abuse of children by \$4 million for this coming year. Yet, we all know that child abuse is on the increase, and if the abuse is not contained, the cost to our society will soar throughout the coming decades.

Domestic violence is a matter of education because a child from a home in which there is a great deal of domestic violence has great difficulty; the Federal Government has seen that; the Federal Government has been asked to enter into that area, and we have, and we have shown success. Yet, the President would have us eliminate very single dollar of Federal spending in an effort to try and do what we can as Federal legislators in a Federal Government to slow down, if not help prevent, some day, domestic violence.

Education for the Handicapped Act. The President would freeze, at the current levels, the two major formula grant programs; State grants and preschool incentive grants. He would reduce by 20 percent the support for deaf and blind centers. He would reduce by almost 15 percent the grants for special education personnel development. That is the personnel that

helps to teach our handicapped youngsters; they need special training. The President would cut the money for their training, their assistance, by 15 percent.

I have many colleagues here today with me who wish to also enter their statements in the record. Before I call on the first one, however, I want to note that Mr. NELSON and Mr. FAZIO have a vital interest, in proper funding of education, but are not able to be here with us today.

First, let me call on my good colleague on the House Education Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI].

Mr. BIAGGI. I want to thank the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as he has and some of my other colleagues, to focus attention on the President's budget proposal for education this year. We are here today to let the American people know the truth about the education budget. We are here to disavow, as we have over the past 4 years the administration's attempt to dismantle our Federal education priorities which have historically worked to assure equal educational opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, handicap, or national origin. I want to commend our colleagues, BILL ALEXANDER and PAT WILLIAMS, for spearheading this important opportunity to bring our case before the American people.

We once again see our priorities terribly distorted. We see an unabashed effort to trade educational opportunities for an expansion of an already bloated defense budget. We do not quarrel with defense; clearly the defense posture of this Nation should be maintained in strong fashion.

We are looking at a budget that proposes a 12-percent hike in spending for defense, and at the same time emasculating many of the programs that have proven to be so successful over the years. We are looking at a budget that will OK \$600 for toilet seats and spend only 60 cents for a child's lunch. We are looking at a budget that talks in terms of military readiness; at the same time, we are essentially declaring war on the very system that assures civilian readiness.

In my 15 years in Congress and in my capacity as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I am proud of what our committee has stood for. I am proud of the programs that we have put into place. I am especially proud of the educational opportunity that we have afforded millions of Americans who otherwise would have been left outside the mainstream of society.

Yes, it was not too long ago that we put into place the final tile in the mosaic that assures every aspiring stu-

dent in our Nation the opportunity to go on to college and postgraduate schools through the guaranteed student loan. It was not too long ago we developed the Pell grant, which is so essential to those poor and disadvantaged to go on to school. So critical for the educational institutions of our Nation to be maintained and to elevate the whole quality of education. These two fundamental programs are the heartbeat of the educational system.

Yet, we are looking at a proposal that, if enacted, would decimate these programs. It would require schools to close; it would turn away from the educational process hundreds of thousands of individuals. It would see us regress to the point of a time when I recall only the well-to-do or the very exceptional students could go on to college. In the city of New York, there was only the city university; all the others had to forgo their college education. We thought we left those days with the progress and the legislation that we put forward. Now, if we enact the President's proposal in his budget, we will see ourselves regress to that point when we could look with shame upon the lack of opportunity this country provided.

Happily, there was an enlightened attitude; the people of the Nation understood that our national resource was the mind of the young man and the young woman who so desperately wanted to be educated; who desperately wanted to go on into the institutions as an opportunity to escape from the poverty, to escape from the ignorance. That was their legacy in those days. No longer does that exist; now there is opportunity for all. That is the way it should be.

However, in the past, the Congress, in its wisdom, rejected efforts to dismantle or dispose of many of the programs that were put forward. It has been said about this program that it was "DOA" or "dead on arrival." Hopefully, that is true. It has been properly said that the "President proposes and the Congress disposes." We have been able to deal with that in the past.

If we are to be successful on this occasion, it is important that we have the student population that are currently attending the educational institutions of our country as well as those prospective students and their parents and the educational community throughout the Nation to once again rise in unity and reject these proposals.

The consequence of them would be so devastating it would take decades to rehabilitate a facility, a process, a mechanism that we have put together, proudly put together. It was not too long ago that under Chairman HAWKINS we had hearings in the Education and Labor Committee in New York talking about the budget. The impact

on New York would be fierce. The impact on the Nation would be just as bad.

□ 1530

To my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], I can only say that what we are doing here today should be the opening gun of a nationwide campaign. To those who are critically involved, those who are deeply interested, let me urge that they take heart because there is the possibility of preserving these programs. We have done it before, and we can do it again, but only if we talk in terms of a unified effort.

And to my colleagues in the House, let me suggest that they ponder deeply and long over any prospective action they take or may take with relation to cutting any of these programs. We know we put them in place, we know they have survived the test of time, we know they work, and we know what impact these programs have on our Nation. To do other than preserve them and enhance them would be performing a disservice.

I am confident, I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and others that we can prevail. We can prevail. I am certain we must. In the good name of this Nation and its attention to education, the nature of which is admired by nations and peoples throughout the world, if this Congress does nothing else in this session in the enactment of the budget, it should preserve the educational programs that we have so proudly put together over the years.

In paying my respect to those who have been leaders in that regard, let me say that I served my 14 years on this Education and Labor Committee under the chairmanship of the late Carl Perkins, and I recall him fighting so well and so long and so hard, overcoming seemingly insurmountable odds, revealing new initiatives. At first it sounded like heresy, but upon study there was acceptance, and upon acceptance there was a very substantial product.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of those years. I am proud that I served under that illustrious chairman. I would be terribly saddened to have to participate in a session that would see the dismantling of the gem and jewel of our Nation's effort, the educational system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. BIAGGI] for his good words and, of course, for his work to improve and enhance America's education excellence through the years.

I now yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards under the full Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that we are all very mindful of the economic policies of the President and his administration, supported by a majority of the Members of this Congress, that have produced the tremendous national debt that we face today. It forces us to reestablish our national priorities to prevent this debt from rising any further.

The President has suggested that the education of young Americans is not one of these priorities. The proposals put forth by the administration in the education budget amount to a monumental step backward in the progress of our Nation.

It long ago became a national objective to provide basic education for all of our young people and to enable those who wished to further their education to have the opportunity to do so. These policies have worked. They have not only allowed the children from all economic and income levels to attend our colleges and schools of higher education, but they have truly created America's superiority and strength in the world of nations.

If the administration's proposals are put into effect, the Federal Government will be relegating many young Americans to a second-class status in our Nation's higher education system. But worse than that, the restrictions on aid and the requirements for increased student contributions will preclude many young people from attending any school beyond high school. These are individuals whose contributions to society will be far less than what they are capable of.

As we strive to become the world's leader in new technologies, we are told not to provide educational opportunity to millions of young Americans. How can we hope to compete with a dozen other nations—China, the Soviet Union, Korea, Taiwan, Germany, Japan, and many more—who will be preparing their young people and their young leaders in math, the sciences, the military, languages, diplomacy, and advanced technologies while we step backwards?

In the same message, the President tells us we must increase our military forces, our missiles, sophisticated planes, sophisticated engines, ships, weapons, and space weaponry.

Mr. President, we ask you here in Congress, who will operate these instruments successfully? Will only the few who can pay their own way be enough to do the job?

The Greek philosopher Thucydides said:

A nation that draws too broad a difference between its scholars and its warriors will have its thinking being done by cowards and its fighting by fools.

The task of bringing the budget into balance, we know, will be a long one. We must make many decisions, but we must not lose sight of the future needs of this country. The future lies in the young, those who are learning to use their abilities.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation needs the full contributions of all of its citizens in order to meet the challenges that we will face. To deny access to higher education to anyone in our society threatens our very ability to overcome those challenges. As we advise our colleagues on the Budget Committee, let us remind them that an enlightened and intelligent youth will be our country's real and lasting strength.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] for that fine statement.

There are those—and, tragically, in my opinion, the President is among them—who say that American education has declined significantly in the past 20 years while Federal funds for education have increased significantly in the past 20 years, and, therefore, the increase in Federal involvement must be responsible for the decline in educational achievement. I do not know that the two are connected at all, but I do know that the American people are justly proud that they have literally wrought an educational miracle in this country in the past quarter of a century, indeed in the past 100 years.

In 1870, 2 percent of America's people graduated from high school; today, 80 percent graduate from high school. In 1960, when Jack Kennedy took the oath of office, only 40 percent of black youngsters would graduate from high school; today, more than 80 percent are high school graduates. When Harry Truman was President, only 55 percent of the American people were literate; today, 98 percent of the American people are literate.

Are we doing as well as the other industrialized nations of the world? Far better. Generally our high school graduates and college graduates have higher achievement test scores than the graduates of any other nation. A higher percentage of American youngsters graduate from high school than any other nation. More Americans receive a college degree than do the citizens of any other nation.

Those who believe that the Federal Government has a role to play like to believe that the legislation which has passed this Congress is at least in part responsible for the education miracle which the American people have wrought, particularly during this past quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities

of the Committee on Education and Labor.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we head into a time of budget debate, rise to address what seems to be a perennial debate between those who favor an ever increasing military budget and those who believe that much of this money could be better spent if it were redirected toward education of the people of this Nation. I am reminded of the occasion in the 98th Congress when the honorable chairman of the Education and Labor Committee spoke out, quite eloquently, on the floor of this Chamber, in support of the Defense Education Act. During his presentation he mentioned one of our California colleagues who sits on the other side of the aisle. The honorable chairman made the point that, while it is the conservatives who espouse the virtues of frugality and the need for a balanced budget, in actuality they are the Members who continue to vote for the big military buildup items.

He did that by referring to the total dollars of the appropriations that were voted on by that Member that were primarily military items, and then comparing that to the appropriations voted on by one of the big spenders on our side of the aisle who is another colleague from California. The difference was dramatic. The disproportionate dollars for the military versus the dollars spent for social programs.

My Republican colleagues responded in his defense by stating, and I quote, "When you read the Constitution, you find the principal responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense." He rationalizes his support for runaway defense spending by voting against responsible and thrifty education assistance legislation, which costs a minuscule amount in comparison to what is spent on the escalation of several of the individual military programs, not to mention the military budget in its entirety.

I believe that the gentleman is referring to the Preamble of the Constitution, and for the moment, I would like to equate this passage to the report language that we use to clearly spell out the intent of the legislation we enact. Just to be clear as to what is stated therein allow me to read these familiar and revered lines. "We the people of the United States of America, in order to form a more perfect Union," and I want to stress, "a more perfect Union, establish justice," now listen carefully, "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility," I repeat, "insure domestic tranquility," oh yes, and by the way, "provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of Amer-

ica." Now I want to repeat again the last part, the most relevant and culminating passage: "Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity."

I would submit that we not so narrowly define "common defense" to mean a military buildup against foreign intrusion, but that our "common defense" also means providing for security of our families and properties in the establishment of a law enforcement and justice system.

Now how do we do that? By just providing for the common defense as interpreted by my colleague from the other side of the aisle? Now, in my opinion, my colleague has misinterpreted the substance of what I have just read. Nowhere in that statement of intent are we provided with a sequential listing of priorities for legislative action. The establishment of justice, the promotion of the general welfare and so forth, are all meant to be equally considered in our efforts to provide effective government based on democratic and pluralistic goals.

Here is the major stumbling block between the administration and its supporters and those legislators, both Democrat and Republican who believe in a balanced approach to government. The authors of the Constitution, in their wisdom, declared that the purposes of Federal Government are manifold. They knew the worth of an educated citizenry and the value in providing a sense of security to its seniors and disadvantaged. I would recommend to all my colleagues they not forget this important fact. While my colleagues who support this incredible military buildup may take a short-sighted view of this Nation's common defense, voting only for repeated increases in the mammoth military budget, and initiating exorbitant military systems that only escalate the deadly race for military superiority, providing a false sense of security to the people of this Nation, they must never forget, and I am here to remind them, that it is our people that are the greatest deterrent to war. Our people, educated and active, provide the most effective and responsible guarantee of peace and strength.

□ 1540

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

I yield to the chief deputy whip of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I applaud the initiative and leadership of the gentleman from Montana in taking this time today to address this national concern. I applaud the gentleman for displaying the kind of leadership over the years that has prevented

a disaster from occurring in the field of education in the United States.

Few people in our Nation have the patience for the detail that is presented in a budget document submitted by the President to the Congress. However, if the President had had his way over the last 4 years, the amounts of funds available to educate the youth of America would have been drastically reduced in such a way that States like Arkansas, poor States that depend upon Federal programs for the education of our children, would have been severely damaged by those proposals. It is the diligence of strong and courageous Members of Congress that have prevented that from happening.

While America today appears to be consumed with what many people consider the preeminent issue to be reducing Federal spending, we can do our part in reducing waste, fraud, and duplicitous actions of the Federal Government without taking the lifeblood of Federal education programs away from the youth of America.

Mr. Speaker, the most precious resource of any nation is the youth of that nation. It has been said that the greatest investment one can make is in young people, because it is they who are the future.

The Federal Government has made such an investment through support for education. We reap the benefits of that Government investment every time we get into our automobile, and not onto our horse. We reap those benefits when we adjust our thermostat, instead of going outside to chop wood.

Educating our people has made America the world's leader in inventiveness. We helped spur the industrial revolution but that was nothing compared to the technological and computer revolution which we started. New advances in medicine have made us healthier and able to live longer lives. Advances in learning how to use land more effectively has made it possible for us to feed more people than we were able to ever before.

Education has brought the world closer to home by teaching us to understand the languages and customs of peoples about whom we once knew nothing. Consequently, education has broadened our horizons as Americans, and strengthened America as a world leader.

I attended a one-room schoolhouse in Carson Lake, AR, when I was a young man. While a single light bulb illuminated the room, the education I received illuminated my mind. But my attendance at Carson Lake was possible only because of Government investment in education. Without Government support, the doors of that little schoolhouse may never have opened; a mind possibly closed forever to the wonders of life. I learned what a progressive, compassionate govern-

ment could do to educate its people and lead them to discover for themselves a new and better life.

Mr. Speaker, we are now being presented with a budget from the President which would reduce the Federal commitment for education. Instead of an evenhanded budget policy, Mr. Reagan proposes to increase defense spending by more than 12 percent while cutting investments to education by 4 percent. Mr. Reagan does not realize that the United States hasn't maintained its military superiority over the Soviets by outspending them, but by outsmarting them.

A 4-percent decrease in educational investment doesn't sound too bad on the surface. But a study by the Congressional Research Service shows that Federal funds to 21 educational programs has decreased an average of 21.23 percent in real terms between the year 1980 and fiscal year 1985. If an average of 10 percent of Federal investment in each of these 21 programs is withdrawn, it is estimated that more than 3 million students would be affected.

That same study reports that when Federal funding for education has been reduced in the past, jurisdictions faced with these cuts have—

First, served fewer students and maintained the same services per student;

Second, served the same number of students but provided fewer services; or

Third, eliminated certain programs altogether.

But the most striking aspect of this study is that most jurisdictions generally reduced the number of students served in roughly the same proportion that Federal funds were reduced. It was also reported that few funding reductions were replaced with State and local funds.

This administration takes an aloof position when it comes to commenting on the proposed cuts in the education budget to higher education. Secretary of Education, William Bennett, commenting on the proposed cuts at a February 11 press conference, said:

It may require of some students divestiture of certain sorts—stereo, automobile, three weeks at the beach divestiture. I do not mean to suggest that this will be the case in all circumstances; but it will, like the rain, fall on the just and the unjust alike.

For some reason Mr. Bennett assumes students take the Government aid granted to them and spend it wildly. Mr. Bennett seems to be unaware of the procedures involved in dispensing money to the students. All tuition, fees and other charges for attending schools of higher education are first deducted from Federal aid. If there is anything left over the students may have enough to buy their books. I think it is absurd for Mr. Bennett to insinuate that most students

are buying vacations, cars, and stereos with their financial aid. I have had too many college interns working in my office to know that this is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, it is the dream of all parents in America that their children be successful and have a better life than they had. Education is the road to success in our modern age. If this administration doesn't want to improve that road, the least we could ask for is that it not be made worse.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for those kind words.

I yield to a new and valued colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSTAMANTE].

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, not 2 years have elapsed since the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued its report: "A Nation at Risk." The report was the object of much fanfare by President Reagan as a demonstration of his commitment to improving America's classrooms and student performance. Former Secretary of Education Bell made public appearances, heralding the President's dedication to academic excellence. The report spawned much-needed reforms in educational standards. The President rightfully brought this important issue to public awareness; but, the administration's pomp and circumstance over education has become noticeably muffled. The report now collects dust on a shelf; its contents forgotten by the individual who commissioned it.

Since publication of "A Nation at Risk," our country's educational systems have been working more closely than ever to improve academic standards. Implementation of these reforms will be a futile gesture if the Congress approves the budget cuts for education proposed by President Reagan.

If we cut back Government's role in assisting students to afford the costs of higher learning—if we reduce program funding for language—minority students—if we shrink State grants for migrant education—do we not impede America's ability to meet our leadership challenges? We have sacrificed enough by freezing most programs for elementary, secondary, and vocational education. To carry forward the administration's proposals will reverse the progress of education and subsequently the progress of this Nation.

Government's role in education has been: First, to maintain excellence in scholastic standards; and second, to educate all who desire an education and are able to pursue it. Proposed administration cuts renege on our responsibilities in meeting these objectives. Costs of higher education continue to escalate. They require finan-

cial sacrifices on the part of students and the families, middle class, and poor alike. America's interest in encouraging students to continue with higher scholastic achievement cannot be means tested. America's needs for talented under- and post-graduates cannot be limited to those with family incomes under 130 percent of the median. America's requirements for a trainable, skilled labor force in this complex society cannot be subdivided along working class lines.

Isn't it ironic? An administration that creates corporate tax expenditures for an expanded economy reduces its investment in the human capital that will manage it.

Isn't it ironic? An administration that instigated reforms for educational excellence now restricts accessibility to higher learning.

It is beyond irony, Mr. Speaker. It is contradictory.

The comfortable technological superiority America once enjoyed is becoming vulnerable. Other industrial countries, friends as well as foes, are on the dawn of achieving technological parity with us. To approve proposed cuts is tantamount to abrogating our global leadership position.

All of us understand the critical need to hold down Government spending. Our educational institutions and students should not be exempt from sharing in the sacrifice we all must make to reduce the deficit.

Yet, in moving toward the goal of lower budget deficits, the sacrifices must be spread evenly, shared equally by all.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to resist the administration's proposed reductions and give careful consideration and support to a freeze in spending for education. A freeze would, no doubt, decelerate the momentum in educating our human resources; but it would not retard the progress of that undertaking. Either we freeze the hands on the clock of educational advancement; or we rip years off the calendar of progress.

The choice is ours to make.

□ 1550

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Texas and appreciate his remarks.

I now yield time to our valued colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Montana for his initiative in taking out this special order. It is something for which we owe him a great debt of gratitude.

The administration's budget is such a multiple assault on education that it is hard to know where to begin. We ought to be very clear that the dispute that many of us have with the President, and those who support him in this body, is not over the level of Fed-

eral spending. I do not think the President has sent us a budget which has an inappropriately high level of spending.

What the President has sent us is a budget which has the level of spending very much out of whack as to where it goes. The increase in the military, the increases in the other parts of the budget highlights the attacks that are being made on education.

I want to talk a little bit about money. One of the favorite metaphors that gets used in political debates is that you cannot solve a problem by throwing money at it. Let us concede one thing. Given the problems that we deal with in Government, you cannot solve problems. We are not in the problem solving business. The Federal budget is not Rubik's cube. What we do is to alleviate problems and we make improvements. We try and provide some incremental advance.

Money is a very important part, although only a part of that. You almost never hear people denegrating the importance of money for a program they care about.

When is the last time Ronald Reagan or Caspar Weinberger, or John Lehman, or any of the others told you that you cannot provide a strong defense by throwing money at it. When have we been told that you cannot solve the problem of social injustice in Central America by throwing money at the Central America military?

These are the people who were the original money throwers when it is for something that they think is valuable. So the pretense that there are really ways to deal with these things without money, only people who have more than enough money think that money is not important.

There are obviously other factors that have to come into play. There are questions of proper discipline. There are questions of proper incentives.

But you cannot simultaneously cut back on the resources society provides for education and improve education.

Yes, you can do some things that will make other things better, and there ought to be a coordinated program. But it will not work when you are shrinking the resources, and for a couple of reasons.

One thing that is very ironic is we have an administration and a group of supporters who are very much impressed with the importance of incentives, and they tell us that the economy runs on incentives. And if you want more of something, you have to weigh more, you have to reward people. Apparently they believe we have discovered a race of people who are prepared to educate our children who are immune from this incentive business. Somehow they have found somewhere people for whom financial incentives do not apply.

Now there are some incentives. They tell us, therefore, give 1 out of every 20 teachers a couple of bucks in some kind of a master teacher program. That is nice if you happen to be the 1 in the 20 of those teachers, and I happen to think that some kind of an incentive for superior teachers is a good idea. But if you are going to continue to underpay everybody else as we have, then you will have the situation where the American people who have children in the public schools will be asked to entrust their children for most of their children's waking hours, for most of the year, to people that we pay so little that they would not even entrust their cars to them, or their rugs, or their houses, but they will give them their kids all day because somehow money does not count for them.

That is nonsense. Money is becoming of more importance for two reasons.

First of all, we are making some progress in this society, fortunately in discrimination, and there is a diminishing of sex discrimination. A young woman graduating from college today—things are not perfect for her, there is still discriminatory aspects—but I am glad that we were recently reminded of how serious a problem sex discrimination now is even in this administration by the noted feminist Jeanne Kirkpatrick, and I admire her for disagreeing with those in the administration who would poo-poo the notion that there is still sex discrimination, and she made the point that it is still there. But it is less.

Thirty years ago a bright young woman who was graduating from college was overwhelmingly being pushed into teaching. The law schools would not allow her in, to their shame. Now we have more opportunities for young women, not as many as we should have, but more.

We had for many years a kind of unearned increment of teachers because of sex discrimination. The supply of teachers was artificially inflated by the fact that a young woman did not have the options that she would have elsewhere. That has been diminishing and that supply is going down some. And if we do not compensate economically we will have problems.

In other words, we are no longer going to have first-rate teachers solely because some young woman could not go elsewhere. There are still going to be people who want to teach and there still will be people who will have that sense of vocation. But it will not be as many as it was in the sense that some people were involuntarily put into teaching.

I talked recently with a woman who is a very good chemistry teacher in the State of Massachusetts. She is a very good high school chemistry teacher

and she is in her fifties, and she is there because she was not allowed when she graduated from college 35 years ago to be a research chemist. Now, fortunately, young women can be a research chemists.

Second, we have a problem with high tech. It is becoming very, very difficult to get people with technical skills to be able to compete with the kinds of job offers elsewhere. So there are restructurings that are important.

But to pretend that you need a lot of money for Central America if you care about it, and a lot of money for the Pentagon, and a lot of money for space, and money for water projects, money for the Japan-United States Friendship Commission and Mr. Wick and his friends so that they can fly all over and write impressive speeches, but that you do not need money for people to be adequately paid who have children's lives under their control, then do not be surprised when the education system continues to falter and does not produce what it should.

I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks and it was a good point that he brings up about priorities when he talks about defense spending versus spending for education.

It is instructive to me that the President's proposal seeks to draw 2,800,000 college-bound students, the vast majority of the middle-income students, more than 90 percent of them. He proposes to drop them from assistance so that they can find their way into college. All of these savings that will be gathered from cutting those 2,800,000 students out of college assistance will be spent by the Pentagon in 23 hours, because the Pentagon, under the President's budget, spends at the rate of \$786,000 a minute. And we have to ask ourselves if that is a correct priority.

Mr. RUSSO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now yield to our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. Russo] such time he may consume.

□ 1600

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget proposal reflects his belief that a strong defense system is needed for our national security. I agree with the President, but we part ways on what makes up a "strong defense." It's not just MX missiles and stealth bombers—our strongest asset which will ensure our continued dominance into the future is an educated citizenry. What use are sophisticated weapons systems if we lack the qualified personnel to operate and direct them? When we are dealing with technology which can literally

destroy the world, wouldn't you feel more secure knowing that our military force had the educational background necessary to operate these systems safely and effectively? This is a defense we know will work.

President Reagan does not agree with this. Although he claims that the fiscal year 1986 budget proposal is a "freeze" on social programs, this is just another attempt to mislead the American public. Would a "freeze" force 800,000 students out of the Pell Grant Program? Would a freeze reduce bilingual education by 17 percent? Would a freeze mean that 8,000 to 10,000 schools would have to leave the school lunch program? This list can go on and on.

What this reveals is an attitude of neglect, and in fact of indifference, to what is the cornerstone of a strong democracy—an informed and educated citizenry. Somehow this administration seems to feel that people are out there free-loading, that the educational assistance is unnecessary. Former Acting Secretary of Education, Gary Jones, when asked where a student would turn for aid said, "They've always had the money at home. Their parents have chosen to buy a car or make some other kind of investment." He added, "to presume that students can't go to college because of these budget proposals is a little bit presumptuous."

I think this would come as a surprise to parents and working teenagers facing thousands and thousands of dollars in costs to get an education. Are we to believe that it is not the role of the Federal Government to invest in what ultimately is to its own best advantage? Isn't it interesting that President Reagan himself said 3 short years ago, "as a nation, we are dedicated to excellence in education. It makes a better life for our children as individuals and it further secures the liberty which we cherish." Apparently his support for this concept extends only to words, to rhetoric, not to the bare bones structuring of a decent education for our young people.

And my concern is for the younger children also. What are we saying about our future when we remove as a national priority our support for education and for the health and welfare of children? President John Kennedy said it well when he commented, "When the youngest child alive today has grown to the cares of manhood, our position in the world will be determined first of all by what provisions we make today—for his education, his health and his opportunities for a good home and a good job and a good life." What does President Reagan's budget call for in this area? We are, for example, asked to drastically reduce the child care food program. Can a savings of \$50 million nationwide truly justify the potential demise

of a system which provides meals for 76,700 family day care homes feeding 272,000 children?

What it comes down to is that this administration does not have its priorities straight. Since 1981, there has been a 21-percent reduction in education funding while there has been a 77-percent increase in defense. If we reduced our B-1 bomber force by one-half, we could pay for our entire Federal budget for education. Which will be more productive? Which will lead to a more healthy and strong society? I can't see any benefit which would result from the B-1 bomber that can compare to an educated populace.

Must we keep pouring money into defense systems that don't work. Shouldn't we invest in our youth's intelligence, ingenuity and drive. These assets aren't developed by defense dollars but by a strong educational system. I agree with Edmund Burke who said "that it is on the sound education of the people that the security and destiny of every nation chiefly rest."

I thank my colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to our honorable colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman very much for this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, certainly as we look at our Constitution we realize that education is not one of the things given specifically to the Federal Government in that Constitution, but through the years it has been tremendously important that the Federal Government has done things in this field.

When the State of Florida became a State in 1821, at the first meeting of their State legislature they asked for assistance from the Federal Government to establish a university.

It took them until the Morrill Act came in and in the late 1800's we had a land grant college bill, for this action to be accomplished. Certainly it was very important to the State of Florida, and there have been other places where we have had a marriage of the military, you might say, because the military had a lot to do with the land grant colleges. They required military training.

Mr. Speaker, as our Armed Forces become more and more dependent on advanced technology, we will need even greater numbers of personnel to fill many technical positions. As it stands now, this is a problem, for there is shortage of trained technicians, the very people we need to work with the technology.

The answer lies in the American education system. Senator THURMOND and I therefore, introduced the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act in this past Congress. The House bill is H.R.

40. This act would provide technical training to high school graduates who, in return for Government provided financial assistance, would agree to serve in the military at a pay scale commensurate with their training.

As the sophistication of modern weaponry increases, so does the need for individuals with specialized technical training. How critical is this need? The Navy has reported that it has been able to fill only 53 percent of its needs for entry-level engineers. The Army reports that in Army Reserve units alone 250,000 technically skilled personnel are needed. The Marines report that pilots fly only half their scheduled training flights simply because the corps does not have enough skilled technicians. We cannot afford to continue our present policies.

The Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act requires the Defense Department to establish an alternate program to recruit and provide technical training to high school graduates in return for a commitment for future active or selective reserve duty. The Defense Department would pay for up to 2 years of full-time schooling. And upon completion of training, the enrollee could be promoted to a military pay grade between E-3 and E-8. The advantages of such a program are numerous.

By allowing participants to choose how they will meet their military commitment, the program would attract more personnel into the services. And individuals would be allowed to pursue their training in their home community, thus enabling the enrollee to serve our country without leaving home for more than basic training and the annual 2-week Reserve duty.

Further, this legislation would dramatically reduce costs. It would not require the creation of any additional Government schools but would make effective use of proven, high quality training systems: the Nation's community, technical and junior colleges. By shifting the technician training from Defense Department schools to local schools, a large number of DOD instructors would be able to return back to areas where they are critically needed. A defense consultant has stated that this act would save a minimum of \$12 billion over 5 years.

Further, this program would give the military a much better return on its investment. In many skill categories in the services, training alone takes up more than half of the initial 4-year enlistment. Under this legislation, investment in an E-5 level technical specialist would be paid back within 20 weeks of entry into the service instead of the 50 weeks it takes under the current system.

In addition, these trained individuals will eventually become available to the private sector and will greatly increase our Nation's base of skilled techni-

cians—this will benefit our economy as our Nation seeks to further improve its international competitiveness.

In closing, let me say this: it is clear we are facing an acute shortage of military technicians and the present system is incapable of addressing the problem.

With a recovering economy, the present problems will only be made worse. The continuation of our strong defense posture is dependent upon the development of a highly trained technical force through the American education system. Our national security has rested upon our technical superiority and we can no longer afford to ignore this growing problem. I believe that the Skilled Enlisted Reserve Training Act represents a positive step in alleviating a potential Achilles heel in our national defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his many years of commitment to assure excellence in American education, and I thank him for his patience in waiting for time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky who shares with his father a great name in education in this House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Montana for allowing me to take this time today to address an issue that is very dear to my heart, as it has been very dear to that of my family for a number of years.

Indeed, I am talking about the matter of education.

You know, education is something by which we are allowed to tailor our thought processes for the future. Our children, our grandchildren are allowed in their own manner through the medium of education to have an idea how they are going to deal with generalized processes, in the way they are going to run their lives and how they are going to deal with the specific problems of their encounters as they go through life.

In the past 4 years we have seen an increase in the Federal deficit from \$900 billion to \$1.8 trillion today.

What we have done in effect is to borrow financial capital from our country's future and transfer that capital to today.

What we have done is take that capital in an attempt to solve today's problems with the future's resources.

What we are also doing at the same time with the President's budget proposal, coupled with that deficit that we are running and the capital that we are borrowing from the future, is an attempt to limit the intellectual capital that we have in our country today.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, what we are talking about is, in effect, to try to limit the number of people who have an opportunity to solve tomorrow's problems. I ask you

is that not something like taking a double-barreled shotgun, like we have back in Kentucky, pointing it at the future and blasting holes in it, on the one hand where we are borrowing money from the future, and, on the other hand, we are restricting our Nation's access and ability for the children of tomorrow, the leaders of tomorrow, to have the intellectual capital to deal with those problems?

I submit to you that what we have been given as a Congress and what this budget proposal is, is that very exact thing; we are doing something about the future, and what we are doing is not paying attention to it. We are being nearsighted, we are not looking at the importance of education, we are not looking at the importance that the deficit is having upon us today for the future.

□ 1610

I would submit my distinguished colleagues that what has got to be done is we cannot limit the access to people who want to go to college. If you wanted to go where I went to school today and you have two students who go to that school, if you are going to be living at home you would be having to survive on less than \$12,000 a year. That, I submit to my colleagues, is not good public policy. That, I submit to my colleagues, is in fact an aberration in thinking. That, in fact, is doing something about our Nation's future that we cannot afford today.

I urge this session of Congress to take strong action not merely to hold the line on these advances in education because we have seen real cuts there, but to deal with the problems of the future, to deal with the things that are important to this country long term we must have aid for education in the United States today. We must move toward education in the United States today. No backward steps. We must advance. We must go on.

I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has recently submitted his budget to Congress. Consistent with previous years he significantly increases funds for military expenditures, and again reduces funds for education. In particular, higher education has been selected to bear the brunt of his proposed cuts in this area.

I am well aware of the size of the budget deficit and urge the President to work with Congress to close the gap between outlays and revenues as quickly as possible—Preferably with an across-the-board spending freeze.

However, I feel we can live within budget constraints and still maintain a commitment to programs that are vital to many American families, particularly those wanting a better life for their children through a college education.

Let me share the effects of the administrations proposed student financial aid cut on the First District in Minnesota which I represent:

First, 3,000 students who qualified for aid this year, will be excluded from receiving any grants, work study funds or direct student loans, because family income exceeds \$25,000. The administration makes no allowance for family size, or the number of children currently attending college.

Second, an additional 3,000 southeastern Minnesota students will not qualify for guaranteed student loans, because family income exceeds \$32,500. Again no allowance is made for family size or the number currently attending college.

Third, rates for those who still qualify for guaranteed student loans would be the Treasury bill rate plus 3 percent. Currently, this would result in an interest rate of about 11 percent contrasted with the current GSL rate of 8 percent. This increase in interest will cause financial hardship for many recipients. Further, as interest rates rise, the interest cost to students would be overwhelming, and would place students at great financial risk.

Fourth, the \$4,000 cap for total Federal aid is of concern to both private and public colleges and universities. Private colleges are concerned that without higher funding levels, many students will be foreclosed from attending the institution. Minnesota State universities are concerned that the cap would limit educational opportunities for married students and single parents.

Fifth, the definition of independent student status is too narrow. I would urge my colleagues to carefully consider exceptions such as students who are orphans, married, or single parents.

The effect of the Reagan budget on education is far-reaching. It affects hundreds of thousands of students and their families, restricting, for many, the possibility of a college education. I urge my colleagues to join me in reordering our budget priorities so that necessary aid for college students remains available to those who need it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman.

I understand that our time has expired. I say to the two or three gentlemen who are waiting that additional time will be yielded for their statements in just a few minutes.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, several Members have already spoken about education. I do not want to be repetitious, but I think it is important to re-

alize that the dialog that we had today is a part of an ongoing dialog. The full Education and Labor Committee commenced today a series of hearings on the education budget. Last week the Committee on Elementary Secondary Education had a series of hearings throughout the country.

It is important that all Americans understand the importance of this dialog on education. We do not realize that whereas in other areas such as defense the complexities of today's world readily recognize the necessity for increased cost, but our educational apparatus has been allowed to deteriorate to the point where it is a Neanderthal apparatus.

We are not spending nearly enough money for education, and yet we are proposing cuts. We are also proposing cuts for programs that are as basic as the school lunch programs. The school lunch programs get poor youngsters off to a good start on the school day. This dialog involving every aspect of education must go on, the American people must be awakened to the point of understanding that their leaders are taking a Neanderthal approach to education when we need to join the 20th century and have the kind of educational apparatus that can compete in today's world.

The Soviet Union is graduating far more graduates than we are, and yet we are proposing to cut back on the aid for college students. We are locked in a battle which might be compared to the battle between ancient Sparta and ancient Athens. We, of course, could be compared to Athens. We have freedom, we have the opportunity for people to grow, we have the opportunity for free discourse and dialog, and we want to defend that way of life. But unless we buckle down and spend the kind of money necessary to train the kind of gladiators, intellectual and scientific gladiators, that can maintain our own in that world, we are going to find the security of this Nation is jeopardized.

Education is vital to our national security, and our leaders must be made to recognize this.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.
 ● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in today's special order concerning the Federal Government's commitment to education. Regrettably, as far as this administration is concerned, the Government's commitment to improving equal and affordable educational opportunity continues to wane with each passing year.

President Reagan has once again proposed drastic reductions in student aid programs which will significantly limit the higher education options for many of our children. While the President has called for a freeze on overall Federal spending, he has proposed a 27 percent reduction in student aid

programs. This disproportionate reduction will reduce the number of student aid awards by 1.75 million and reduce the number of students receiving Federal assistance by 1 million.

In analyzing the President's budget recommendations, one finds that the President has targeted his cuts selectively. The budget calls for limiting grants and direct loans to students whose family income is more than \$25,000, restricting all students to \$4,000 in annual loans and grants, and limiting guaranteed student loans to students whose family income is \$32,500 or less. As the average cost of attending a private college is more than \$9,000 a year, these unfair and unrealistic proposals will discourage many lower and middle income students from applying to and attending the school of their choice.

Just as I am opposed to the President's higher education budget recommendation, I will not support the President's proposed requirement that students earn a high school diploma before qualifying for financial assistance. Not only is this administration intent upon limiting the education options of all but the affluent, but it also refuses to acknowledge the legitimacy of alternative education avenues pursued by millions of committed student. While current law permits non-high-school graduates to receive Federal financial assistance to attend community colleges and trade schools, this administration does not recognize the utility of such training and such support. To those whose educational opportunities and choices are few, the administration would limit those options even further.

One could best summarize the administration's commitment to education as promoting a doctrine of survival of the financially fit. In spite of all the proposed budget cuts which will prevent students from attending the college and university of their choice, the administration has once again proposed a tuition tax credit measure which provides families with tax incentives to send their children to private elementary and secondary schools. I support every family's right to send a child to private school, but not at the expense of our Federal Government's commitment to public education.

Just as the Federal Government has spent years promoting equal access for all citizens to public and private institutions, it should continue to do so in educational institutions by ensuring their affordability. Rather than solely concern itself with the cost of Federal education programs, the administration would do well to consider their value. Unfortunately, this year's budget request does not reflect such thoughtful consideration. ●

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of 1982, I asked the Congressional Research Service to investigate and report on the status of science and engineering education in the United States and the effect predicted deficiencies could have on the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense. The report raised a serious problem in that we were facing a technology gap between the United States and other countries. A gap which could effect our technological edge for both our economic security and national defense. In fact this gap could be much more serious than the Sputnik gap of the 1950's.

This year, CRS updated the status of science and engineering education and, despite the fact that there has been a small increase in the number of degrees awarded, we continue to lag behind Japan and the Soviet Union due to the fact that there is a faculty shortage in these areas. With results in education such as this, it is difficult to imagine why this administration is continuing to put education on the chopping block.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget proposes a 33 percent or \$2.51 billion reduction in programs for higher education. All of this reduction, except for \$100 million, is centered on the programs of student financial assistance.

Included in the President's budget is a proposal to eliminate from eligibility for all Federal grants, loans, and work opportunities, except for the guaranteed student loan and the PLUS/ALAS loan programs, all students from families with an income above \$25,000. This limit would apply regardless of the number of children in the family, the number of children in the family attending higher education, heavy medical expenses, or any other mitigating circumstance.

All students, including poor and minority youth, who have an unemployment rate near 50 percent, would be required to put up an ante of \$800 of their own money before they could qualify for other Federal aid.

No one under the age of 22 could be an independent student unless they were an orphan or a ward of the court. The assumption being made is that everyone under age 22 has a family who can and will help support them in college. We all know that this rosy and idyllic view of happy families all made up of Dad, Mom, Dick, Jane, and Spot is far from the reality of American society today. In fact, only 11 percent of American families are made up of two parents, two children, and the father as the sole breadwinner. The Secretary of Education and the Director of OMB have obviously never met any of the large and increasing number of women under age 22 with children and no spouse.

The impact of this combination of proposals would be to eliminate over 625,000 students from eligibility for student financial aid.

A \$4,000 cap would be imposed on the total aid any student could receive from all Federal programs. Estimates are that this would reduce awards an average of \$1,200 for some 430,000 undergraduates, half of whose family incomes are below \$12,000; 60 percent of those affected would be needy students attending private colleges; their average loss would approach \$1,400. An estimated 200,000 graduate students would be affected by the cap—about one-third of all federally aided graduate students and two-thirds of those attending private universities.

The budget proposes to eliminate from eligibility from the Guaranteed Student Loan Program all students from families with incomes above \$32,500. This would result in removing about one-third of those currently eligible, nearly 1 million students.

The administration further suggests the elimination of the State Student Incentive Grant [SSIG] Program and any new Federal capital contribution for the National Direct Student Loan [NDSL] Program. As a result, 448,000 fewer awards will be available.

Finally, there is the proposal to eliminate the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant [SEOG] Program which has an appropriation for fiscal year 1985 of \$413 million. The College Work Study Program would be increased by \$257 million and up to 50 percent of the funds could be used for grants. Thus, there would be a net decrease of \$156 million for the combined grant/work student program and 378,000 fewer awards would be available for students.

In commenting on the administration's budget proposals for student aid, the new Secretary of Education remarked that some families "are going to have to tighten the belt even further to send their children to college." Under the administration's proposals, students' bellybuttons will be meeting their backbones when they get done tightening their belts as much as the Secretary of Education advocates.

The Secretary of Education believes that students can adjust to these cuts but that "it may require of some students divestiture of certain sorts—stereo divestiture, automobile divestiture, 3-weeks-at-the-beach divestiture." The Secretary's quip is a classic example of knocking down a strawman. Some student financial aid recipients may have an old stereo and beat up car to commute to school and to work, but they are not driving sports cars, listening to music on the latest component systems, and living a life of luxury. The Secretary's characterization of student financial aid recipients as indolent youth is not only

untrue, but it also seeks to divert attention from the pain that will be inflicted on students and their families if this budget were adopted. He is trying to draw a happy face over the dashed dreams and the frustrated aspirations of a generation of students.

Another area of the administration's budget for higher education deserving comment is some of the so-called reforms of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. It is proposed to raise the interest rate to students from the current fixed rate of 8 percent to the rate of 3-month Treasury bills. This will have the effect of greatly increasing the burden of debt on students who borrow under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. We have already seen a dramatic shift from grants to loans in student financial aid as a result of the policies of this administration for the last 4 years. In 1975-1976, grants made up 80 percent of Federal aid provided to students and loans made up 17 percent. Last year, grants and loans were each providing about 48 percent of the aid available to students, and the imbalance will increase this year. Since 1975-76, the actual buying power of grants has decreased by over 50 percent leading to a 123-percent increase in the average amount of loan aid received by students since that time. The administration's proposed increase in the GSL interest rate will continue us on the misguided road of creating a new debtor class in America; our former students.

In the GSL Program the administration also proposes to dramatically decrease the special allowance paid to lenders. The special allowance is currently fixed at 3.5 percent above the rate for 3-month Treasury bills. This means that a lender is guaranteed a total yield on guaranteed student loans of the Treasury bill rate plus 3.5 percent. The administration would reduce the special allowance component of the lender's return from 3.5 percent to 1.5 percent while a student is in school and to 3 percent while a student is in repayment on the loan. There was, of course, no consultation with the private lenders who make most of the guaranteed student loans to determine if they will continue to participate in the program at this reduced rate of return. The GSL Program is providing about \$7 billion to students this year to help them pay for their education. The administration is putting at risk this entire \$7 billion amount by reducing the return to lenders without any idea of the impact of doing so.

When you look behind the administration's budget for higher education and ask yourself what are they really trying to tell the American people, it is apparent that there are three messages in this budget. First, the admin-

istration is abandoning middle-income Americans. The \$25,000 family income cap for eligibility for all student aid programs other than GSL and PLUS/ALAS loans and the \$32,500 family income cap for eligibility for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program effectively exclude students from middle-income families from the programs.

Second, the administration is retreating from the goal of providing choice to students in selecting postsecondary educational opportunities. The Federal policy for the last two and a half decades has been not only to enable students to have access to an education beyond high school but to have the choice of the education best suited to each student's interests and talents. This is a goal that we have only imperfectly achieved. But we clearly have been attempting to move in the direction of providing increasing measures of choice to low-income students since the inception of these programs.

The Secretary of Education recently said: "I have some problems with that as an axiom—that is, the notion that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assure that every student can go to the school of his or her choice." The \$4,000 cap on aid that any student may receive effectively denies to low-income students, eligible for the largest amounts of aid, the choice of many public institutions and particularly of most private colleges and universities. The Secretary seems to be advocating a return to the economic segregation of American higher education—when the poor could only go to low-cost public institutions and the affluent could attend the higher priced and frequently more prestigious private institutions. I find it particularly ironic that an administration that advocates tuition tax credits and educational vouchers to increase the choices available to families in sending their children to elementary and secondary school would turn around and explicitly reject the goal of choice for students and families at the postsecondary level.

Third, the administration is seeking to exclude the most disadvantaged students from educational opportunities despite their rhetoric about helping the truly needy. This aspect of the administration's budget may be less apparent than the previous two. But when you exclude from student aid all independent students under the age of 22, when you exclude all students without a high school diploma or a GED even if they have the ability to benefit from a postsecondary educational program, when you require all students to ante up \$800 out of pocket before being eligible for Federal aid, and when you seek to shift students increasingly toward larger loans with higher interest rates you are hitting hardest the most disadvantaged in our

society. Each of these changes would disproportionately exclude low-income and disadvantaged students from the Federal student aid programs.

The administration's budget proposal for higher education is arbitrary, callous, and stupid. I trust that the Congress will resoundingly reject it.

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my colleague, PAT WILLIAMS, for this opportunity to address the important matter of our national commitment to education. Recent statements and actions by the administration have raised some doubt as to the importance the administration attaches to education.

Most troubling is the way in which the administration budget proposals seek to affect our elementary and secondary public school students.

In my State of California alone, the administration seeks to cut \$56.4 million in child nutrition programs. That is approximately a 14-percent reduction in the total program.

California, which shoulders the burden of assimilating between 30 and 40 percent of all the Nation's immigrants and refugees, would have the Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance Program reduced by \$13 million and the Transition Program for Refugee Children entirely eliminated.

Under proposed changes in migrant education eligibility requirements California would lose \$10.9 million—15 percent of current funding—for migrant education.

Impact aid, which compensates a school district for losses in local property tax revenue due to the existence of a Federal military installation, would be terminated. The loss to California would be \$9 million.

The Federal Government cannot shirk itself from its role in the education of our citizens. If we are going to continue to meet the challenge of maintaining excellence in our schools we cannot permit the administration to make such draconian cuts in public education.

I am also deeply concerned about proposed cuts in programs that affect our citizens who seek to attend an institution of higher education. Measures in effect at this time have weeded out much of the problems encountered in the management of the Student Loan Program. Administration proposals that would require students to front the first \$800 of college expenses or to pay for their loans while they are attending class would deprive the poorer among us from receiving the education they need to lift themselves out of the cycle of poverty.

I believe that education is a high national priority. It is our first line of defense against the forces of ignorance and failure. We must all share in the burdens caused by our huge Federal budget deficit, but we cannot ask our

children to pay for their share before they reach the age of majority.

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, last June I came before this body to make a plea for a bipartisan approach in dealing with the critical education problems facing our Nation. During recent hearings held by the Education and Labor Committee in various regions of the Nation I was distressed to find that more people are willing to make partisan attacks against the President of the United States than they are to offer creative suggestions on how the Congress can "get about the business" of improving the Federal Government's efforts in education.

Mr. Speaker, while many members on the Republican side of the aisle do not support every initiative of the Reagan administration in the field of education, it is clear that the other side of the aisle is unwilling to admit that largely as a result of President Reagan's decision to use the Presidency as a bully pulpit, education reform is underway at the grass roots level at an unprecedented pace. Not since President Johnson's attempts to address educational deficiencies through Federal involvement has our Nation placed education at the top of its agenda.

The critical difference is that the Reagan emphasis has been on grass-roots reform. Whether we consider the adoption of local bond issues for education or the significant increase in State reform and funding of education, it is clear that the President has stimulated State and local activity where the major responsibility for education rests. Throughout the Nation we have witnessed new initiatives for excellence in teaching and learning, new teacher salary schedules and career ladder programs, new standards, and increases in parental involvement—just to give a few examples.

It does no good for Republicans and Democrats to hurl accusations at one another. Rather we have a responsibility to make a critical assessment of where and how the Federal Government can have the greatest impact in improving the process of education in this country. We must remember that access and excellence are not mutually exclusive and that spending money is not necessarily the panacea for educational reform. The President is to be given credit for focusing the Nation's attention on education. While I do not agree with every one of his proposals, it is the Congress of the United States that will ultimately decide how much Federal money will be spent and how it will be utilized.

We must make sure that local and State educators are free to do the kinds of things that they have been trained to do, including providing educational leadership. While we must

keep our eye focused on the issue of access for those who are traditionally underserved, we must recognize that we do not have the expertise to provide the educational leadership for this Nation solely from the Congress of the United States.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the roots of the current concern over education in our Nation goes back many years. I think that it is important that we understand that this issue is not one that has come about in the recent months or years. We should also remember that the problems we face are complex. There have been economic, demographic, social, and political developments that have contributed directly and indirectly to our current situation. Partisan wrangling and name-calling will only add to the confusion. ●

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years, we have been hearing a constant refrain from this administration about the importance of maintaining and improving our national economic picture as the way to beat back the immense Federal deficit with which we are being burdened.

As most of us are aware, one of the key elements is the expansion of existing growth industries and the development of new ones. Quite frankly, this will require a pool, nationwide, of young, qualified, college-trained professionals.

Therefore, it is alarming to me that, given this Nation's need for these trained persons—and this administration's insistence on them, we find this administration overturning the cart by suggesting such deep cuts in college aid programs.

Let's face it, shortchanging our young people's education, as this administration seeks to do, will shortchange both their lives as well as the administration's announced aim.

Our industrial base is changing. All of us recognize that. The major industries on which this country depended 20 years ago—steel, railroads, automobiles—are being replaced today with high-tech industries in computers, electronics, and so on. And those new industries need a new kind of work force.

In my own congressional district, I am working with several responsible organizations to rebuild our area, attract new industries, create new jobs. But to attract those new businesses, we need a pool of highly trained people—men and women who have been through our higher education system and who can adapt those learned skills for the jobs of the future.

This administration's proposed cuts in higher education, particularly, will defeat that effort. Almost 1 million current borrowers would be removed from the Guaranteed Student Loan Program by applying the proposed eli-

gibility cap of \$32,500 for adjusted gross family income.

Some 800,000 middle-income students would be dropped from the Pell Grant Program. And seven other aid programs, which provide for another 2 million undergraduate and graduate students, would be abolished.

It has been suggested by some in this administration that many of the students receiving Guaranteed Student Loans or Pell Grants or other forms of higher education assistance are not really in need.

My experience with any program is that there are some who are undeserving, but that those numbers are small. It seems to me that we have here a classic case of throwing out the baby with the bath water in an attempt to eliminate a small number of problems.

Just this Saturday, Colman McCarthy, writing in the Washington Post, told of the responses he received from 90 students at American University when they were asked to comment on the student aid cut proposals. Because of its importance to all of us, I am including this article among my remarks.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1985]

WHEN STUDENTS GRADE BENNETT

(By Colman McCarthy)

They had taken a direct hit the day before. To find out how it felt, I asked the 90 college students in my course on peace studies at American University to write their reactions to the Reagan administration's proposals to reduce student aid.

William Bennett, the new secretary of education, had supported cutting off loans and grants for more than 1 million students. The limit would be \$4,000 a student yearly and \$32,500 family income. For the victims, Bennett socked them with sarcasm: It is time for "divestiture" of stereos, cars and beach vacations.

I have a diverse class—undergraduates from 18 to 22, a retired coal miner, a native Alaskan, a neighborhood mother, foreign students (Kuwait, India, Bahrain, Nepal), the president of the campus chapter of Young Americans for Freedom and a left-of-left 20-year-old woman who has twice been to Nicaragua on school breaks to serve the poor.

The diversity is refreshing to me, but the differences among the students constrict like bolts tightening into place when the subject is William Bennett's thinking. Except for five or six students who supported the secretary, everyone else found the Reagan administration's crabbed ideas about college students and their finances either grossly biased or absurdly unworkable.

The picture that emerges from these 90 papers counters the one offered by Bennett of many students—of private-school rich kids scamming the government for grants and loans. American University is private, but well over half of the kids in my class—a representative group—are working. Many have two jobs. One student has three. A fair number work full-time, and then scratch around for night courses that fit into their degree program.

One senior told of the doubling of costs since her first semester in college. The rise is due to regular increases in tuition and the

decreases in Social Security survivor benefits. She writes: "I am making it because I have worked part-time all through school and full-time in the summers [while] taking night classes. My family cannot afford to help me substantially since I also have a brother in college and a sister beginning next year. I have benefitted from university scholarships because of my grades but I still have to take out a guaranteed student loan from the bank and other loans from the government to cover tuition and expenses."

The student has loans out for more than \$15,000. A classmate, in her late twenties, was once in a similar fix. She was forced to leave school to earn enough money to come back. Another student is working 30 hours a week, which is a rest from her summer schedule of 70 hours in "two jobs day and night to save for the next school year." She argues that under Bennett's plan "the poor and the rich will get an education and the middle class will get the shaft as usual. . . . How are parents supposed to squeeze their wallets any tighter when they have others in school, several loans out and barely making ends meet?"

This student has a three-year-old \$100 stereo, no car and "can't afford a trip anywhere—even home to New York."

From the papers, I sensed that only about one in five students was at the university under ideal conditions: no financial aid, no jobs, and parents paying in full. Several students said they knew of campus leeches who didn't seem to need aid but wrangled some anyway. Another told of a friend who ran up debts but has found a dodge to avoid paying them.

These offenses against fairness came up in a number of papers, but they were few compared with what most others saw as the unfairness of the Reagan administration.

American education is in vibrant condition when a student can write, as one of mine did, that "Bennett's words came straight from his heart, which is hollow. How can you possibly want to cut student aid? That money goes to a good cause. . . . There are many families that earn more than \$32,500 that have many children close in age. They can't possibly afford to send, let's say four kids at one time to school. It's also a cop-out saying the kids spend the aid on cars and stereos. It's just an excuse, and a lousy one at that."

In addition to these in-class essays, I asked the students to pick one word to describe their feelings about Bennett's thinking. The YAF president, a quick-witted and likable lad, said "justifiable." That was the minority view. These were typical of the majority: confused, irrational, horrifying, idiotic, spaced-out, addle-minded, unbelievable, barbaric.

A peace-studies class is a fit scene for students to discuss the politics of tuition. Economic war has been declared on the 90 kids in my class, and millions more across the country. They are fighting back with sure-fire weapons: sound ideas and stories of personal sacrifice. It is hard to imagine that Congress will abandon the students.

I would suggest all of us read this piece because it bears out the points we are making: that our students need this aid and that it is in the best interest of this country to provide this kind of assistance.

Depriving our young people of a college education deprives them of the opportunity to seek jobs in our new in-

dustries and deprives us all of the chance for a better life. Education seems expensive, but there are few things more expensive in today's world than the lack of one. Besides, the investment we make in our youth today will be repaid severalfold in the years after they complete their education. ●

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to express my support for the Vocation Education Act and to urge the full funding of programs that operate under this act.

These programs pay for themselves over and over again. They take untrained workers and give them highly competitive skills. They take low wage earners who have trouble holding down a job, and turn them into more highly paid workers with highly competitive and sought after skills. They take low and sporadic taxpayers and turn them into individuals who over time contribute far more to the Treasury than they ever receive from the Federal Government under these programs.

Despite the value of vocational education, Mr. Speaker, the President has once again submitted a budget request that is far below that which is needed. The President has ignored the intent of the Congress in passing the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act. He has submitted a request that is more than \$200 million short of what the Perkins Act authorized and a budget that fails to fund several key programs, including the high-tech partnerships program.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we fully fund vocational education. It is time that we recognize the advantages of a more skilled work force and reap the benefits of a program that will strengthen the economy and lead to a healthier Nation. ●

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, fulfillment of the American dream has traditionally been based on upward mobility through education. Even the first colonists, facing enormous challenges, made the establishment of a local school a high priority. Until now, each generation has surpassed its parents' education in terms of breadth, depth, and quality. Today's education system faces crises at two levels: in the quality of education and in the changing role and expectations of education in an increasingly technological society.

The means to address both these problems are at our disposal. Through working together, we can set goals for our schools, support the work of schools and educators, and determine what role education will play in a changing world. Advanced technology will continue making vast changes in the marketplace, leisure activities, and the home. The achievements of the last fifty years in medicine, space science, and electronics will pale in comparison to the next century's quantum

leaps in these and other fields. Education will provide the springboard and the bridge to these developments.

The Federal Government plays an important role in supporting education. But Federal funding is limited: Contrary to popular belief, the Federal Government is the smallest funder of education. The Federal Government's funding for education is only about 10 percent of about \$230 billion which is spent on education in each school year. Of the rest of this funding, about 39 percent comes from the State, about 24 percent from local governments, and about 28 percent from other sources, including tuition, endowments, and private gifts and grants.

I believe the Federal Government should maintain its relatively small but vital role in supporting education. I believe that the Department of Education can be a guiding influence in this effort. The Department can fund research into improved teaching methods, can support programs of high Federal priority—like supporting civil rights—and can help fund programs for special groups of students—like the handicapped and the disadvantaged.

There is an old Chinese proverb which should characterize our approach to education. It says:

If you are planning for a year, sow rice;
if you are planning for a decade, plant a tree;
if you are planning for a lifetime, educate a person.

Mr. Speaker, this is sound philosophy we should all live by. ●

● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to applaud my colleague PAT WILLIAMS from Montana for arranging this special order although I am greatly distressed by the events that have induced it. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed budget for education will hurt the American people. I am amazed by the cynical precepts it is based on. In the last few years, this administration hailed efforts to reform education in America and indeed claimed credit for that reformation. This year's rejoinder seems to be: "Do as I say, not as I do." This is a cruel game the administration is playing and the stakes they are betting are the youth of this nation.

For the sixth consecutive budget from this administration, the President's proposals would accelerate the decline of Federal expenditures on education. We have heard time and time again that the ultimate responsibility for education funding lies with the States, not the Federal Government. We all know what the President's budget message is for the States: "You're on your own." Under this budget proposal the States will be hard pressed to find alternative funding sources for crucial services such as police, fire and mass transit. The unalterable fact is that the States will not

be able to make up for shortfalls in education funding.

It is obvious to me that this administration is relinquishing its responsibility for education in America. We have heard the cavalier comments made by David Stockman and William Bennett, the new Secretary of Education: If students sell their cars and stereos and skip vacations they will be able to afford a college education.

These proposals will deny 1 million young people that dream. We owe it to the students and parents throughout this Nation to oppose these shortsighted and cynical proposals. I thank the gentleman for his time. ●

● Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, when I talk with young people throughout my southwest Virginia district, I am impressed not only by their depth and breadth of knowledge, but also by their recognition of the need to expand their educational horizons to meet the challenges of the 21st century. They are eager to develop the insights and skills they will need to compete successfully in the emerging high-technology workplace and to contribute to the wealth of knowledge that will guide our Nation's journey beyond the year 2000.

The administration's fiscal year 1986 budget proposal responds to this yearning for knowledge and excellence, by slashing postsecondary education programs 36 percent. In my view, the administration's proposal is shortsighted, achieving short-term budget savings by robbing many of our young people of the opportunity to contribute to our future and by weakening our college and university system.

In the past, this Nation has responded to the challenges of the international arena with a call to arms to our young people and to our educators. In the post-World War II and post-Sputnik eras, when we were confronted with a revolution in technology, the response to our call to arms was unparalleled. Our response to that challenge enabled us to reclaim our international leadership and stature.

Today the international arena is no less threatening. We face new international competition in the areas of trade, technology and the ideas that guide the evolution of new governments and nations. Yet the administration has chosen to respond to these challenges by significantly reducing assistance to young people who aspire to a higher education and to colleges and universities that are the breeding grounds of the minds and ideas that will chart our Nation's future.

In Virginia alone, 26 percent of the students now receiving guaranteed loans may become ineligible for that aid under the administration's proposal to eliminate from the guaranteed loan program students whose family

annual income exceeds \$32,500. Others will be affected by the \$4,000 per year cap that the administration hopes to place on total college student aid including guaranteed student loans, Pell grants, and work study grants.

At Virginia Tech 2,900 students will be affected by the administration's proposal. The university will lose at least \$2.6 million in assistance. At Radford University, 40 percent of those now receiving guaranteed student loans will be ineligible under the administration's plan, and hundreds more will see their total aid package reduced. Community college administrators project that the cuts proposed by the administration will substantially alter their institutions' educational mission.

Those students most effected by the cuts will not be the sons and daughters of the very rich who can afford the costs of a college education. Those who will be hurt are the sons and daughters of low and middle income families. The administration's proposal will dash the educational dreams of many students who depend on the Pell grant, guaranteed student loan, supplemental opportunity grant and work-study programs. These programs are not unqualified give-aways. They are programs designed to provide means-tested assistance to families who cannot fully absorb the financial shock of today's higher education costs.

Mr. Speaker, many of those dropped from the student aid rolls will be forced to leave school, and the increased competition for both students and charitable aid will debase the value of a college education and erode the quality of our Nation's institutions of higher learning. We will lose the immeasurable value and contributions of probing minds, and we will be less prepared to meet both the current challenges and future demands of an increasingly competitive international environment.

If today's students, colleges and universities lose, we all lose. We will lose our hope for a future of educational and institutional excellence, a future that once lost can not be quickly or cheaply regained.

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the future of this Nation is dependent on the investment it is willing to make in its youth. For many years the Federal Government has taken steps to ensure that all students receive the educational services they need, and that promising students, no matter what their background, are afforded the opportunity to pursue their educational goals. The President's recent education proposals would put an end to this trend and reverse our Nation's commitment to fully educate our children.

The President proposes to attack education at every level. Among other

things, funding for Head Start would be frozen, as would the Education for the Disadvantaged Program; two programs aimed at improving educational opportunities, the Magnet School Program and Women's Educational Equity Program, would be totally eliminated. Financial aid for college students would be seriously curtailed by allowing aid only to students whose family income is below \$32,500 and capping the total financial aid package any student can receive at \$4,000.

If enacted, the President's proposal would severely impact my home State of Connecticut. Remedial instruction would be cut to about 650 students in the State. Of the 20 school districts that receive impact aid because of the presence of a Federal facility in the district, 19 would become ineligible. Three hundred severely economically and educationally disadvantaged youth, 1,100 adults with training and retraining needs, and 900 students who would be trained in high technology skills, would lose vocational training opportunities.

Even more severe is the impact of the President's proposals on students currently enrolled in the State's institutions of higher education. About 24,000 students would become ineligible for student loans; 3,500 would lose Pell grants; 1,200 would lose State student incentive grants; and 1,200 would lose work-study grants.

While clearly the Congress must consider alternatives to the way education is currently financed in this country, it must be done in the context of rationalizing and restructuring our approach. It should not be done in the arbitrary way proposed by the President, which will make education unattainable for some and even more inadequate than it currently is to meet the needs of others.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to express my concern about the President's cuts in our Nation's higher education budget.

America's educational system is surely among the finest in the world and one of its strengths is in its access by students of all economic ranges. This opportunity for a college-level education is the direct result of Federal loans and grants to those who would otherwise not be able to meet the rising costs of a higher education. In my home State of Florida, it is estimated that over 47 percent of students enrolled in higher education institutions—universities, colleges, and community colleges—received some form of financial assistance.

In next year's budget, President Reagan has proposed a restructuring of student aid programs. Financial assistance to students would decrease by 23 percent in fiscal year 1986—from approximately \$4.6 billion last year to \$3.5 billion.

Two programs, the supplemental education opportunity grant [SEOG] and the State student incentive grant [SSIG] would be eliminated altogether. In Florida, over 64 institutions participated in the SEOG Program. Eighty-one institutions participated in the SSIG Program last year—benefiting over 14,000 recipients.

Under the President's proposal, guaranteed student loans would be limited. In Florida, the average loan amount per calendar year was approximately \$2,500 to over 88,000 students—students who otherwise may not have been able to pursue an education after high school. Based on those figures, almost 10,500 students in Florida would be excluded from the GSL Program should President Reagan's income cap be imposed.

Recent news accounts have described renewed collection efforts for defaulted student loans. I encourage the Department of Education to equitably and efficiently collect loans debts from students who have abused the aid system. But the fact remains, we should not take away the means for a higher education for future students—who may responsibly repay their debts—because of mistakes of former borrowers.

Education is no exception to the rising cost of living. The cost of a college education today is over \$6,000 per year. At a public institution, this figure is nearly \$5,000 and for a private institution, close to \$9,500. I emphasize that although these amounts represent tuition, board and other expenses, this accounts for only 9 months of a calendar year, not the total living expenses of a college student. The tremendous financial impact of higher educational expenses on a middle-income family with a child in college is obvious.

America's educational opportunities should be available to all. We need to insure that educational freedom of choice continues to exist for all students regardless of financial status, desiring a higher education. By reducing the Federal guarantees and grants to lower and middle income families, we restrict the opportunity for higher education to many deserving and ambitious students.

The future of our country depends on the quality of the individuals in our society. Undisputedly, higher education is an important factor in the progress of national economic and social well-being.

Therefore, the question is not whether we can afford to continue funding student aid programs, but whether we can afford not to.

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed cuts in student financial assistance amount to a devastating attack on middle-class families. Unable to justify these cuts directly,

our new Secretary of Education has stooped to creating caricatures of stereo-laden students merrily ripping the Government off through these programs. Like most stereotypes, this one proves to be accurate in a few instances, but maliciously misleading in the vast majority of cases. Secretary Bennett's caustic remarks reveal not only a hostility to the traditional role of the Federal Government in assuring equal educational opportunity, but also an imprudent willingness to denigrate those who would defend that role.

Widespread access to quality education is essential to the well-being of our democratic society. Without an educated citizenry, the political freedoms of our democracy would become hollow. Without an educated citizenry, our commerce and military strength would soon stagnate. Without an educated citizenry, our cultural and spiritual vitality as a nation would be greatly diminished.

In our society free of hereditary distinctions, where merit provides the only rank, education has always served, at least in principle, as the great equalizer, the principal channel of social mobility. Universal access to education has long figured prominently in the canon of our democratic values. Since the Second World War, the Federal Government, supported by an overwhelming public consensus, has moved to make that value a reality. Through a variety of loan and grant programs, the Federal Government has largely succeeded in making good on its commitment to assure equal access to higher education. In an era when the value of higher education is ever increasing, the Federal Government would be unwise to retreat from that commitment.

The President's budget proposal, supported so vociferously by Secretary Bennett, would, simply put, make it impossible for many middle- and low-income families to send their children to college, let alone to the college of their choice. The budget would slash student financial aid for higher education by 25 percent, from the fiscal 1985 budget authority level of \$8.6 billion to \$6.3 billion. Secretary Bennett justifies this \$2.3 billion cut as a means of better targeting aid to poorer families. But the specifics of the budget proposal amply refute that claim.

Secretary Bennett would do away with supplemental educational opportunity grants [SEOG], awards based solely on need. More than 700,000 young people most deserving of support would lose grants if this program were eliminated. Under the administration's proposals, Federal matching funds for State student incentive grants [SSIG], would be terminated, depriving another 300,000 students of aid. Secretary Bennett would also stop

Federal capital contributions to the National Direct Student Loan [NDSL] Program, thereby reducing the number of students able to benefit from the program by more than 150,000.

The administration's budget proposal combines these outright eliminations with a number of new eligibility requirements on all forms of aid. A cap of \$4,000 per year would be placed on total Federal aid per student, and all students receiving aid would be required to contribute at least \$800 per year to their education. The administration would impose its most drastic restrictions on the two largest programs of Federal aid—Pell grants and guaranteed student loans [GSL]. The budget proposes absolute limits on allowable family income of \$25,000 for Pell grants and of \$32,500 for GSL's. These income limits would allow no distinctions based on family size or on the number of children in college. Clearly then, their intent is not to target aid to those most in need, but simply to provide arbitrary means of reducing overall funding. Families with more than one child in college would be the most hard hit. All together, these tighter eligibility requirements would deprive more than 800,000 students of Pell grants and more than 325,000 students of GSL's.

As a result of the proposed cuts, more than 1 million students would, by the administration's own figures, lose support for their higher education. The American Council on Education estimates that the figure might well approach 2 million. From figures provided by the administration and the American Council on Education, I have compiled a summary of the consequences of the administration's proposals:

NATIONWIDE EFFECTS, BY PROGRAM

Program	Funding (millions)			Student awards (thousands)		
	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Change	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Change
Pell grants	\$3,371	\$2,880	-\$491	2,827	2,019	-808
SEOG	414	0	-414	720	0	-720
Work/study	959	850	+255	788	1,130	+342
NDSL	192	0	-192	956	812	-144
SSIG	76	0	-76	304	0	-304
GSL	3,744	2,715	-1,029	3,226	2,900	-326
Total				8,821	6,861	-1,960
Unduplicated				5,280	4,252	-1,027

The effects of the administration's proposals on my home State of Ohio would be devastating. Pell grant funding would be cut by more than \$28 million. Ohio students would lose another \$18 million in SEOG and SSIG funds. Direct student loans would be slashed by \$7.4 million. And most important of all, GSL's would be reduced by \$76 million, a cut of nearly 30 percent. Approximately 28,000 students would lose their loans.

All together, the administration's cuts would cost Ohio students more than \$130 million in aid. From figures provided by the American Council on Education, the Department of Education, the Education Commission of the States and the Ohio State Student Loan Commission, I have compiled the following summary of the effects of the administration's proposed cuts on Ohio families:

EFFECTS ON OHIO, BY PROGRAM

Program	Funding (millions)			Student awards (thousands)		
	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Change	Fiscal year 1985	Fiscal year 1986	Change
Pell grants	\$148.9	\$120.6	-\$28.3			
SEOG	15.6	0	-15.6			
Work/study	22.3	31.8	+9.5			
NDSL	7.4	0	-7.4			
SSIG	3.0	0	-3.0			
GSL	266.9	(190.5)	(-76.4)	108.2	(80.0)	(-28.2)
Total			-130.7			

The administration's proposed cuts in financial aid for students would force our Nation to take a giant step back toward the days when only the rich could afford to send their children to college. A number of the best private universities in the country have already announced that financial pressures have forced them to abandon longstanding policies of disregarding financial well-being in making admissions decisions. We must work to reverse this trend and to assure that equal educational opportunity is not compromised. If there are abuses, let us have genuine reforms. But let us not use these as excuses for the wholesale gutting of programs that serve millions of deserving students.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concerns about the President's proposed budget regarding education. I believe the Federal Government's commitment to ensuring access to quality education for all out Nation's youngsters must be maintained and strengthened. Yet, many of the educational proposals in the fiscal year 1986 budget do not reflect such a commitment.

Similarly, the Federal role in vocational education is critical. The Perkins Act passed in the last Congress authorizes a strengthening of that Federal role. For the benefit of the Members of the House, I would like to submit for the RECORD an analysis by the American Vocational Association of the adverse impacts the proposed budget would have on vocational education in America. Let us not allow the intent of the Perkins Act to be ignored for the sake of temporary reductions in the Federal budget.

Following is the American Vocational Association analysis:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Congress reauthorized the vocational education act in October of 1984 and set in

place a new initiative to sharpen the federal role for vocational education. Under the new law, federal funds will be utilized to assist the states to provide vocational education programs and services for those traditionally underserved individuals and groups, to assist the state and local education agencies to modernize the programs of vocational education, and upgrade existing programs which address the labor market problems facing the communities.

The new law recognizes that vocational education is a unique component of the American education system, that it bridges schools and the work place, and provides alternative learning for thousands of youths, who without such an option, would become dropouts from school and society. In addition, the law provides a new focus on training and retraining adults and emphasizes the need to increase vocational education for homemakers and single parents along with other targeted groups. The record shows that federal involvement in vocational education has caused these programs to expand. Federal policy has set the direction for vocational education changes and improvements and provided the catalytic action required to keep it in tune with work force needs for more than a half century.

Funding history

Fiscal year:	Millions
1980.....	\$779.2
1981.....	681.6
1982.....	655.8
1983.....	728.7
1984.....	738.5
1985.....	742.1

NOTE.—Presidents proposed budget fiscal year 1986, 742.1 (including Smith Hughes).

IMPACT

The administration's budget for FY 86 would freeze the overall authorization for vocational education programs at appropriated fiscal year 1985 levels. However, the administration is proposing to eliminate the line item authorization for consumer and homemaking education based upon the assumption that this is not a federal priority. This action, if agreed to by Congress, would severely damage the state and local programs of consumer and homemaking education and send a signal to the states that these programs should be phased out. In addition, the administration's budget ignores provisions of the new vocational education act and the intent of Congress through the budgetary process.

Specifically, the President's budget ignores:

1. The mandated set-aside for national programs: The Perkins Act stipulated that 2 percent of the basic state grant will go towards national programs. If the basic state grant is \$716 million, then the funding for national programs should be \$14.32 million, not the \$8 million requested by the administration.

2. Several critical authorizations under the Perkins Act: The budget does not provide funding for community based organizations, high-tech partnerships, adult training and retraining, guidance and counseling, and bilingual education. Those line item authorizations were mandated to meet a pressing need in vocational education—those needs still exist and will be difficult, if not impossible, to meet under the new budget.

3. The unique and necessary Federal role in supporting Consumer and Homemaker Education: The Administration states, "Consumer and Homemaker Education is not a Federal priority, it can be funded

under the Basic Grant program...[giving] state officials greater flexibility to target funds on the areas of greatest need." This is inaccurate.

4. Funding needs of vocational education: New federal initiatives contained in the Perkins Act will not be adequately funded by the administration proposal. The new law assumes new initiatives, new direction and in fact using set-asides, mandates new programs. It was crafted upon the assumption of funding levels of \$950 million. A funding level of \$741 million violates the intent of Congress. The new law will not adequately serve the needs if only \$741 million is appropriated.●

Mr. WILLIAMS. 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 today.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1620

THE ANZUS TREATY ALLIANCE

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

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I have requested this special order today to underscore a matter of deep importance, the breach of the spirit of the ANZUS Treaty alliance by New Zealand through their denial of port access to U.S. ships that are nuclear powered or armed and the worldwide implication that this incident may have on our country's efforts to provide an umbrella of protection for our allies.

Indeed, should this ban be a denial which others follow, we will not be able to fulfill our worldwide commitments. We cannot have our other allies around the world following the same practice of expecting our protection while at the same time not fulfilling their own obligations so that we can provide that very protection.

This is why New Zealand's actions are so disturbing and so very serious and why we must respond clearly and effectively.

When the ANZUS Treaty was signed by Australia, New Zealand and the United States in 1951, it was agreed that an attack on any one of the three parties in the Pacific area would be considered a common danger to all. Our ability to carry out our own obligations depends critically on port access. Port access is particularly consistent with article 2 of the treaty, which mandates continuous effective self-help and mutual aid to maintain and develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

How can ANZUS continue to play an effective role in the region if one partner denies port access to another partner? The importance of port access

has been reaffirmed repeatedly by ANZUS councils and most recently in July of 1984. The Labour government of Prime Minister Lange rejected this when they announced on February 4 that New Zealand would not accept a visit by the U.S.S. *Buchanan* during an ANZUS sea exercise.

To understand the seriousness of this situation, consider the ripple effect that this decision could have for our country around the world. If New Zealand, the first nation in the world to enforce such a ban on nuclear powered or armed ships could take such a position without a strong reaction on our part, it could reasonable be expected that other nations might follow suit. After all, New Zealand is not the only nation that has political and other groups that are advocates of nuclear free zones.

Fortunately, other allies have been able to recognize the importance of cooperation and have withstood various political pressures in this regard.

For example, our European allies face strong opposition over the deployment of nuclear missiles, Pershing missiles. This was not just a visit by a ship which might have nuclear weapons on board but rather it was the actual placement of nuclear missiles on their own soil.

Yet realizing the strategic importance of these missiles, European leaders were willing to take on their responsibility and go forward with the deployment. Other nations, such as Japan, which is understandably sensitive over the nuclear issue, and Scandinavian nations, which seek to maintain their neutral status, have never denied access to any U.S. ship.

To a certain extent, the political pressure in New Zealand is similar to what is now occurring in New York City. Last year the Navy announced that Staten Island, part of my congressional district, was selected as the preferred site for the Northeast Surface Action Group. Some local political leaders, citizens groups and, yes, even Members of Congress, have demanded to know whether or not the seven vessels involved will be carrying nuclear missiles.

Following their policy, the Navy refuses to confirm or deny the presence of nuclear weapons. Some members of the New York City Council have even introduced a resolution to declare New York City a nuclear free harbor.

Unlike New Zealand, however, the people involved represent a very small percentage of the population, and the vast majority of my constituents—and I say better than 95 percent of them—are anxiously awaiting and will welcome the arrival of the Navy to our shores.

Now, our surface action group is just one of many which are located in ports around these United States. Our

citizens have shown that they are willing to be responsible and do their part in the defense of their Nation. We have not asked New Zealand to bear any risk that we ourselves do not bear in order to enjoy the protection of U.S. forces.

It should be noted that the third partner of the ANZUS Treaty, Australia, has remained strong in support of the alliance, despite political pressures, and has not taken a position similar to that of New Zealand.

It should also be noted that Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, during her visit last week to this country, was severely critical of the actions of the New Zealand Government.

New Zealand's defense policy for the past 30 years has been built upon the ANZUS alliance, a mutual security treaty. The very nature of such a treaty demands shared risks and responsibilities. However, New Zealand seems to want all the benefits of the alliance without sharing in any of the risks. This is an irresponsible position and disregards the principle of mutual responsibility of allied nations.

The United States carries a tremendous burden protecting freedom around the world, and we certainly do not need those who ask for such protection banning U.S. ships from their ports.

In response to the ban, the United States has canceled a number of military exercises and meetings. Perhaps we as Members of Congress would want to take further action, including the possibility of economic measures, in order to send a clear signal to our allies around the world as to how seriously we view the actions of New Zealand.

Prime Minister Lange has said that if we impose such sanctions we will find New Zealand to be less cooperative militarily.

It is hard for me to envision how New Zealand could be any less cooperative militarily than it is now.

The implications of their action can be so far-reaching that we must take a firm position. Perhaps an end to preferential treatment for New Zealand in the export of wool, meat, and dairy products would send a message to New Zealand and our other allies just how serious we view this action. The stakes are too great and we must let the world know that this body will not stand idly by when a treaty nation disregards its mutual responsibilities of alliance and greatly hampers our ability to be the protector of freedom around the world.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

□ 1630

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for making this very important statement about the necessity of the Western democracies hanging together, hanging tough like we did during the Euromissile crises, as result of which was we finally did bring the Russians back to the table at Geneva, not because we were divided and weak, but because we were united and strong.

I think that Prime Minister Thatcher was greatly disturbed by the fracturing of this solidarity, and I think she expressed it very clearly to us. I can recall, and I think the gentleman was here at the same time when she addressed a joint session of Congress, when she mentioned that with our strategic programs under America's nuclear umbrella, we have maintained for the free world peace for 40 years. She went on to quote Winston Churchill when he addressed a joint session of Congress. He said to America basically this: He said, "Don't give up your strategic weapons until you are very, very sure that you can live without them." Basically, Churchill acknowledged that it was under this strategic umbrella that democracies in fact were seeing a long period of peace that had not existed in the early part of this century.

I applaud the gentleman for his straightforward statement and I hope that New Zealand will come back to the fold of solidarity and hang tough with the rest of the West and will get off this high horse and I hope that no sanctions will be necessary.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; I agree with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this issue to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI], for arranging this special order to focus our attention on New Zealand's breach of trust in its friendship with the United States as an ANZUS ally.

New Zealand's decision to ban U.S. ships which might be carrying nuclear weapons seriously undermines our Nation's ability to fulfill its obligations to the ANZUS Mutual Defense Treaty of 1951.

The United States has a firm policy of not confirming or denying the presence of nuclear weapons on any ship. This is done to insure adequate security. There can be no exceptions to this policy without seriously endangering our forces. Therefore, New Zealand's action extends to all U.S. ships.

New Zealand's policy, although not a violation of the 1951 treaty, does constitute a break in the spirit of the alliance. As partners in the arrangement,

we are obligated to maintain and develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. However, our Nation cannot do this if our Nation's ships are not permitted access to New Zealand ports and waterways.

We have, unfortunately, been forced to cancel six defense training exercises since New Zealand's policy was first enforced in early February of this year.

In the absence of such peaceful naval cooperation between our two countries, it is difficult to perceive how the ANZUS Treaty could be depended upon to deter invasion of the Pacific area by a potential aggressor.

The irresponsible policy being implemented by New Zealand thus poses a major question to the future of ANZUS, because the need for deterrence is the central thrust of the agreement.

I strongly agree with President Reagan's remarks stating that "We deeply regret the decision by the New Zealand Government to deny port access to our ships. We consider New Zealand a friend. It is our deepest hope that New Zealand will restore the traditional cooperation that has existed between our two countries. Allies must work together as partners to meet their shared responsibilities."

Other countries, including some of our NATO allies, have also expressed their disapproval of New Zealand's decision. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, Margaret Thatcher, recently expressed her disapproval, by joining our country in its policy of not identifying whether or not ships are carrying nuclear weapons.

The Speaker, I submit that New Zealand is not fulfilling its obligation as an alliance partner. A good partner should continually demonstrate a readiness to cooperate. New Zealand apparently, is not willing to do this.

Due to this breach of partnership and trust, the future of the ANZUS alliance is now in question. I support my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asian Affairs, Mr. SOLARZ, in calling for hearings this month to review ANZUS.

I do not feel the United States should tolerate this sort of treatment from a nation which we have regarded as a friend and ally. As a nation, we can continue to consider New Zealand as a friend. However, it is dangerous to allow such behavior from our allies.

If the United States tolerates irresponsible actions such as this from one ally, other important nations might be encouraged to follow suit. Other countries might view this as an opportunity to adopt a policy of selectively fulfilling their treaty obligations and to assert more forcefully their positions on nonalignment of nuclear weapons.

Such policy can only serve to weaken the security of their nation and ours.

Accordingly I urge my colleagues to support our call for a thorough review of New Zealand's action and the implications it has for future relations between that nation and the United States.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding, and I just want to rise for a very brief moment to commend the gentleman for taking this special order to discuss this very important issue, and especially to commend the gentleman because, as he pointed out, he comes from an area of the country where there has been some political support for the concept of a nuclear-free zone. I know what that is like; my State of Minnesota is another such area of the country where we have political movements that are always generating opposition to our strategic policies where the concept of a nuclear-free zone has gained some currency. I doubly commend the gentleman because I know it is a position that is difficult to defend in his region of the country as it is in mine.

The only point I would add to that is that I really think the important point the gentleman made, the most important point, and the point that I hope is understood in New Zealand is that we are fully justified, and in my judgment, obliged, to make some kind of a strong reaction in this country. The argument that we should soft-peddle this issue for fear of offending the New Zealanders in my judgment is basically false. The people in New Zealand need to understand why.

The reason is fundamental and elemental. That is because ultimately the strength of the defense of the free world is far more dependent on our ability to hold the alliance together than it is on anything that goes on in the Eastern bloc. We have managed to respond fairly successfully to the threat from the Eastern bloc ever since the end of World War II. We have shown our capacity to defend freedom against the Soviet bloc. What we are unaware of and unsure of is how we would fare if the unraveling process began that the gentleman from New York referred to. That is why it is important for the people of New Zealand to understand that although we respect their integrity and their sovereignty and their national pride, this is a threat to the entire defense of the Western World and a very strong reaction from our country is not only justified but obliged in my judgment.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. SUNIA].

Mr. SUNIA. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and I commend the gentleman for this special order so that we might address this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, in my mind, New Zealand has behaved very badly. There is no question but that it has failed to live up to its commitments for the joint defense of the area. To set conditions for receiving into its port our naval vessels is most irresponsible. The spirit of ANZUS was to jointly share the burdens of common defense.

Should not New Zealanders be glad that the taxpayers of this country are paying for their defense? While they spend their tax dollars perfecting a cradle-to-grave welfare society, we in the United States are having to give up a lot of living essentials so that we can pay for defense—ours as well as New Zealand's.

Our State Department is quite correct in its attitude. We are not interfering with New Zealand's internal politics. Our concern is its policies toward its friends and allies.

For American Samoa, our lone territory in the middle of the South Pacific, closer to New Zealand than to the United States, the New Zealand refusal is of real concern. Of course, our own Pago Pago Harbor is opened to our own ships at any and all times, and Prime Minister Tofilau Eti Alesana of Western Samoa has kindly offered the facilities of Apia Harbor to our U.S. Navy. We appreciate all that, but it does not solve the problem.

The problem now is that there now exists a question: Is New Zealand truly and honestly serious about defense? Do the antinuclear and pacifist groups in New Zealand seriously believe that the Soviets will leave them out of an all-out nuclear conflict in honor of their antinuclear beliefs? Is New Zealand, reputed to be more British than the Britishers, and more educated than most Pacific residents, really that far away from the rest of the world that realities have escaped them?

In a real conflict, can one count on defense partners like New Zealand? That to me is now the real question.

I am aware also of the concern at the State Department about the effect of this New Zealand rejection on our other allies with whom we also have defense arrangements. Supposing our friends in Europe pick up from the New Zealanders, we will really have a monumental problem.

And I do not put too much credit on Prime Minister Lange's preferences of continued friendship and cooperation. He cannot come to us with clean hands and blame certain factors in his country. We have our own antinuclear groups. They too are vocal and power-

ful. But that is all internal. We do not go around the world complaining about them and blaming them for dictating policies. Mr. Lange is the Prime Minister and the show is entirely his.

Should we retaliate? I think not. We regret the actions of our friends, but let's not be retaliatory. It will serve no useful purpose. I am aware of how easy it is to get up on this floor and sermonize about merits of patience and tolerance. Out there in the real world, the forces at work may only respect responses that are packed with force and thinly veiled threats of economic disasters.

But I still believe there is time to work on our friends. We dare not allow them to dictate to us, but we should not be without the patience of the older and bigger partner.

Then there is also the rest of the area to consider. The New Zealand problem may not be the lone problem for Uncle Sam in the area. I suspect others will begin to surface in the near future. The blame belongs to us. Like a yard you neglect, you soon find all kinds of bad weeds growing with abandon. The Soviets now roam the south seas at will and make the small Pacific island nations all kinds of offers. The Cubans are in Vanuatu, and the French problem in New Caledonia may broaden into a messy one for the area—and there could be a spill over into other parts of the Pacific.

My point is, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for us to seriously review our Pacific situation. In our concerns for the peoples of Southeast Asia, our trade with the Orient, and the oil routes into the Pacific, we may be overlooking little troubles brewing in our own backyard.

We share the Pacific Ocean with New Zealand. We also share the Pacific with all the newly created island nations. But we are still the big brother. Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe retaliation alone is the proper form of response. I believe we should work a little harder on our difficult friend. After all we are working very hard with our adversaries.

□ 1640

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for a very profound statement. I think he highlighted the very serious problem that exists in that section of the world.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] for taking this special order on a very important subject, which applies not only to our Nation's foreign policy, but also applies, as he well knows, directly in the State of New York.

The fact is that I spent a little more than a year in the course of serving in the MacArthur command in Australia. I never visited New Zealand, but I know that the spirit of the Australian soldiers and the spirit of the New Zealand troops was outstanding. Certainly in the early days of World War II New Zealand opened its arms to the marines who had borne the brunt of the first assaults in the Solomon Islands and Australia also opened its arms to the American forces who mobilized in Australia and then gradually moved through New Guinea and the Philippines and finally settled the end of World War II in Tokyo Bay.

I think one of the interesting things is that this particular syndrome which has been enshrined by the new Prime Minister of New Zealand and by some of our colleagues in New York originally was born through the three so-called nuclear principles set up by the Japanese. The Japanese, of course, having been the only country to feel the effects of the atomic bomb were certainly determined not to bear any of those attacks in the future. They set up three nuclear principles.

The first was that there would be no atomic bombs produced, no nuclear weapons produced in Japan.

The second was that no nuclear weapons should be stored on Japanese soil.

The third principle was that no nuclear weapons should be carried anywhere near the shores of Japan; but these nuclear principles, while you can recognize their application and you can recognize where they came from out of Japanese history, it turned out that Japan in the United States-Japanese security treaty recognized that they were protected by the nuclear umbrella of the United States. They had seen that the Soviet Union had developed nuclear weapons and that other countries were trying to achieve nuclear weapons, so the Japanese, although they did not want any nuclear weapons stored in their own territory or even to build them, they recognized the need of a nuclear umbrella and that nuclear umbrella was provided by the United States-Japanese security treaty, but in recent years the more knowledgeable and progressive members of the Japanese Diet recognized that the third nuclear principle; namely, that there should not be any ships coming within the shores of Japan carrying nuclear weapons was hardly in keeping with the idea of having an American nuclear umbrella. If you are going to have an umbrella, you obviously have got to carry the umbrella around when you need it.

The only place where American nuclear weapons were available in the Pacific was on naval ships. In fact, that third principle, although it has never been officially repudiated by the Japanese, was certainly worked over

and roughed up considerably a few years ago when Admiral Laroche, the head of the so-called Center for Defense Information—I think more often it is the Center for Defense Misinformation—announced to the Japanese on his own responsibility that actually all of the ships, virtually all the Navy ships that went through the waters of the Pacific and came within the area of Japan were carrying nuclear weapons.

□ 1650

This was subsequently backed up by Ambassador Reischauer who said yes, we have had nuclear weapons carried aboard some of the ships that came into Japan. They never actually tied up with them, but they had gone along the shorelines. And finally the Japanese realized that it did not make sense for them to benefit by the nuclear protection of the United States and at the same time prevent us from bringing the nuclear umbrella that they were counting on into areas where it would be able to provide that particular protection.

This is something that the New Zealanders I think have picked up now because antinuclear sentiments, antinuclear pacifism has become rather trendy and apparently the Socialist government that has been installed in New Zealand thinks that this is going to win it a good deal of congratulatory messages from other parts of the world.

Actually, the ANZUS treaty is certainly not any one of the major treaties on which we rely. We were closely allied with the Australians not only in World War II but also in the Vietnam war, and they have done an outstanding job. But if the New Zealanders do not feel they want to be participants in this kind of a treaty or this kind of an alliance I do not think it is going to upset things too much.

Although as the distinguished delegate from Samoa pointed out a moment ago, the Soviet Union is looking around for possible areas where they can pick up friends or scare people to join their undertaking.

We certainly need to continue to operate our ships in these waters and I think as the gentleman from New York has already indicated, if somebody wants to break up that kind of a treaty I think we have to make it clear that there is a price for doing that.

If they do not want the nuclear umbrella, OK.

But one of the things that the gentleman has referred to has to do with economic measures. I got a telephone call this morning from a farm group in upstate New York concerned about the fact that casein, which is imported from New Zealand in very substantial numbers, is undermining the dairy industry in upstate New York, and there is a bill that has been introduced in

the House that would designate casein, which is now designated as a chemical product, redesignate it as a dairy product and then it would not come in. And I think if the Prime Minister of New Zealand who, as I understand it, is in the country at the present time, I think he might be interested in that particular movement that is going on.

Mr. MOLINARI. If I could interrupt the gentleman a moment, I am running short of time and have three other speakers.

Mr. STRATTON. Let me just say one other thing, and that is that those who have been opposing the ships of the surface action group in New York State are upset that nuclear weapons might have an accident in the gentleman's congressional district.

Actually, we have had no accidents of that kind, and in fact if we were really concerned about accidents we ought to ban propane from New York Harbor and from New York City streets rather than insist that no nuclear weapons should come in.

I think the gentleman is correct and I would like to just close with one comment: You may remember a few years ago, in the 1960's, there used to be a bumper sign that said, "Support Your Local Police." And then underneath it said, "If not, when you get into trouble, call on a hippie."

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for his very kind and supportive remarks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] for taking this time. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] for his statement, and want to point out to them that, SAM, we have not only hurt our casein industry in America, we have essentially destroyed it because of New Zealand imports. And you better believe that there is an economic tie to this military arrangement that we have with the ANZUS treaty.

In fact, TOBY ROTH has a bill in the Congress, a resolution in the Congress right now that calls for a limit of 50 percent of the imports that we have had over the past 3 years, because in 1980 a report indicates that America spent about \$300 million buying surplus, nonfat dry milk from American farmers that could be used in many instances to produce the products that casein is being used to produce, which we are importing from New Zealand.

And, by the way, we import over 50 percent of all of the casein that is produced from New Zealand that comes into the United States, and we all know about the problems that we are having in agriculture today with surpluses, and at the same time, because of this defense arrangement. And

thus, because of the economic ties that we have, we ran in 1980 a \$300 million bill in order to help our friends in New Zealand.

Now I am going to get to what I think the point is, and I have talked to some of my constituents about this issue. People say, and I know that the chairman, the Speaker up here right now, comes from an area in Youngstown, OH, where people say "Why should we have foreign aid? Why should we go out there and help other countries?"

I view foreign aid as really not just a help to them but also a help to America. It is a mutual relationship that is supposedly beneficial to both sides, that we enter into agreements and treaties and alliances because it is in those countries' best interests, and it is in America's best interests. And by working together we all gain something. And we hope in the long run that it is the most successful arrangement that we can have to promote stability and peace in various regions.

I will tell my constituents that yes, it is important to have allies and alliances. But you know, what gets frustrating is when you have to go home and you tell your constituents that we have entered into an agreement, an arrangement, an alliance, but it just seems as though it is a one-way street.

We are doing all of the giving and they are doing all of the taking. And that is exactly the situation we have with New Zealand right now.

We enter into a treaty. They are supposed to live up to their side of the treaty; we are supposed to live up to our side of the treaty. They decide for one reason or another, and perhaps in what could be considered a momentary political consideration that one particular part of that treaty is not acceptable to them. And so then the Prime Minister gets nervous and scared and responds to people out of what is I think clearly political considerations and tells the United States, "Your ships cannot come in." And then a couple of days later on the front page of the Washington Post it says to the United States, "You better not take any trade concessions away from us; you better live up to your end of the bargain, even though we do not want to live up to our end of the bargain. You had better not have any second thoughts about living up to your end."

Then I cannot go home and tell my constituents that we are going to be in agreement and that it is supposed to be a two-way street, and New Zealand has decided to change the street sign, and instead of it being a two-way street it is now a one-way street. We give everything up and they take everything.

I do not think we can continue to conduct foreign policy that way. That is why my constituents and people all

over this country applauded the actions by Jeane Kirkpatrick, because she stood up and she said we are not going to take it anymore, that our relationships and our alliances ought to be two-way streets.

America ought not to be walked on, we ought not to be slapped in the face, and we ought not to continue to give, give, give.

I am glad that this administration is finally starting to say, or this administration is saying now we are going to do some things. We are going to respond because we cannot let you get away with this. You get away with this, and then we are going to have other countries in the world that are going to try to take advantage of their relationship with the United States.

□ 1700

And that does not work to anybody's best interests because the people of this country are going to get frustrated with this. They are tired of one-way streets. I am going to tell you, yesterday in the Wall Street Journal there is a quote here which I will read:

TASKING TASS

New Zealand's Prime Minister David Lange initially was quite confident that New Zealand's ban on U.S. nuclear warships would have no effect on his country's strategic position—but now he seems not so sure. The Soviet news agency was having so much fun chortling about the decision that Mr. Lange finally called in the Soviet ambassador, Vladimir Bykov, and complained. "New Zealand is not to be used as some sort of ammunition in an anti-Reagan administration campaign," fumed Mr. Lange to the emissary of the big nuclear power. Mr. Bykov responded that he would pass along that warning to Moscow.

Now even the Prime Minister of New Zealand is recognizing that there are greater implications than bowing to political pressure as it relates to this country and what has been, I think, up to this point a very good treaty, a very good alliance and a two-way street.

Americans are tired of one-way streets with our allies; I am tired of it; my constituents are and, boy, I will tell you I think we have got to do something now to send some clear signals and messages to the world that we are not going to be patsies anymore.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I associate myself with the remarks of everyone of the speakers on this subject. The gentleman from Guam was especially trenchant; the gentleman from New York as usual hit the nail on the head. Mr. MOLINARI, I commend you for helping us to focus on a rather important issue. I am not angry at New Zealand. I am more saddened

than anything else because I was brought up in the era of World War II. I fought in that war. I was over in New Guinea, I have been in New Zealand a couple of times. It is a beautiful country, they are beautiful people, but I believe in collective security. I believe that if the free world will stay together, will band together, and will share the burdens and the challenges of preserving the peace, we can indeed preserve the peace.

It is not just for us, it is for them, for all freedom-loving people everywhere.

We should be expanding the number of people who are within the circle of freedom, not narrowing it.

When a country that has so long been a beneficiary of collective security, when a country that—when Japan was the aggressor in that part of the world—was happy to share the burdens and challenges of defending the Pacific, suddenly because nuclear weapons have been made into a fearsome subject due to the successful propaganda efforts both in our country and worldwide, they want to opt out of the burdens and challenges of preserving the peace.

I hope it is a temporary aberration. I do not know that we need to retaliate and further drive wedges between ourselves and the people of New Zealand, but I would appeal to their common sense. Surely if war breaks out between the Soviet Union or other nuclear powers, and there are others besides the Soviet Union who have nuclear weapons, they want somebody somewhere on their side with a nuclear deterrence that is credible. Would it not be lovely if we could opt out like they have just done, say that we are tired of modernizing our intercontinental ballistic missiles and building Trident submarines? It costs us a lot of money that we could spend in other more productive ways.

So, you want to opt out? We will opt out. What contribution would that make to freedom, to the peace? It would be a terrible setback.

So is it fair, is it honorable for the United States to carry the burden of the cost and the manpower and the stigma of a nuclear superpower and to have, one by one, those people who will benefit from this strength that we have, this peace through strength, to step back from us and to opt out? That is really not, I hesitate to use the word, but it really is not honorable. We should share these things and we Americans share the responsibility, the economic burden of having those weapons.

God knows we wish we did not have to have these weapons but they are a fact. The Soviet Union has massive nuclear weaponry. What shall we have to counterpoise that? What would deter an aggressive revolutionary system

that has all of these weapons from looking around the world to see where it can expand? The United States and its nuclear arsenal.

We need gratitude and support of those countries who wish to be protected by that arsenal.

So I appeal to the good common sense of the people of New Zealand. I would like to have a debate over there on this issue as to whether they want to be a full partner in the burden as well as the benefits of collective security and if they do, put it on a referendum and let us not have a few activists who have a Xerox machine and maybe access to a few editorial writers, dominate the foreign policy of an important country that has always been a part of the defense of the Pacific and the free world.

So I hope they will think long and hard about it. You cannot have peace on the cheap. Everybody has to share the burdens.

It is little enough to let a ship dock at your port, a ship that you would be sending out the SOS's for if the rockets were ever launched against your country.

I thank you for giving us all a chance to think about this and hope that the people of New Zealand will regain their perspective and welcome our ships. We are allies. We hope that they will welcome our ships to dock at their great country and their great ports.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for his usually fine statement. There are so many important points that he illustrated to us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY].

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, allow me to express my deep disappointment and concern over the recent decision of the Government of New Zealand to deny access to U.S. Navy ships because they may be nuclear powered or carrying nuclear weapons. This is a short-sighted decision and one that could have long-term repercussions that weaken the foundations of Western security.

Signals and perceptions are strong forces in international affairs and New Zealand's current policy may be received in the Soviet Union as an indication that Western public opinion can be manipulated successfully enough to force some governments to hedge on their commitments to mutual defense agreements. Prime Minister Lange of New Zealand has maintained that his Government's policy of seeking a nuclear-free zone does not indicate a weakening of New Zealand's commitment to the ANZUS Alliance, nor is it anti-American. However, no matter what verbal reassurances the Prime Minister is now providing, his actions speak louder than his words.

New Zealand's decision is a disturbing example of a growing tendency in the Western democracies to take for granted the existence of American-led defense alliances. They assume they will always be protected without taking the responsibility to contribute to the common defense. The Washington Post editorial of February 1, correctly labeled New Zealand's action as "freeloading." It flouts the political and moral requirements of alliance. The American people cannot be expected to bear the entire burden for the protection of the free world. All democratic nations must stand together or they face the prospect of falling alone.

I support the administration's response to New Zealand's decision. In addition, I would hope that the State Department will continue to engage in discussions with New Zealand on these issues.

Our friends "down under" must accept the fact that their security does not come for free, nor does it come from a part-time effort based on their convenience.

They must also recognize history, too, that for the past 40 years we have lived in a peaceful world, we have not had any major war. Yet during that past 40 years the United States and the U.S. Navy has maintained a policy of not exposing whether their ships do or do not carry nuclear weapons—those same ships that for the past 40 years have been going into the Pacific, patrolling the Pacific, going into ports, including the Ports of New Zealand. The policy is a proven policy, one that has protected and preserved the freedom of the world and I think we have to look to history to recognize that.

They must also recognize the increased threat that the Soviet Union now has in the Pacific. They now have quite a naval force located at Cam Ranh Bay. They have quite a large aviation capacity also now located in Vietnam.

□ 1710

The threat is there. The threat is real and if we are to counter that threat, we must do it with the proper material and without disclosing the various strengths of our vessels in the Pacific Fleet.

I would like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI], from the Empire State, for taking time today to bring this to our attention.

Mr. MOLINARI's congressional district is one that hopefully soon will be the home port for a surface action battle group led by the USS *Iowa* and Mr. MOLINARI is faced with the problem similar to this and he, I think, has shown the type of leadership necessary in this Congress to ensure that our Navy is received well in its ports and that our Navy can

carry out its tasks to meet the mission that it is designed to do.

I again commend the gentleman for his leadership in this issue.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all representing a district that has the largest body of water which is Deep Creek Lake in western Maryland I am not a player in the scenario of a basing mode for our naval fleet.

At the same time, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am very much aware of the global nature of our naval forces and the importance of that global nature.

It has disturbed me greatly looking at the alliance that we have had between Australia and New Zealand and our country over many years. Nothing has changed. We still have ships that are necessary to make port calls in New Zealand. Nothing has changed there.

One of the scenarios that I think no one has brought out in this entire dialog and it is one that concerns me very greatly and that is the enormous amount of dollars that are spent in New Zealand by the American Government. Because, as my colleagues well know, it is the jumping off place for the tremendous amount of work that we have at the South Pole. The facilities that we have at Christ Church are vital to our research and development programs that go on in Antarctica. That is a program that comes under science and tech, but it is a program that is completely necessitated and funded and tied to our naval involvement there, because without the naval involvement we would not be able to have the logistical support that is necessary for those scientific research projects that are going on at the South Pole. This is an involvement within our Government, the New Zealand Government, one that has worked for such a long period of time.

What concerns me now is having the new doctrine of the Government of New Zealand on the basing and the port calls by our naval ships, are we then going to have to go one step farther and have a problem with our aircraft flying in and out of that Government? I think it is something that we should all be very much concerned about and very concerned about the long term because our expenditure at the South Pole and in Antarctica is a very large one, a very necessary one and one from which we are going to gain a tremendous amount of research and development information.

So, I think this has been just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak, and some-

thing that we should all be extremely concerned about with the New Zealand Government.

I want to once again compliment the gentleman from New York and I appreciate the opportunity to join with him on this issue that I think is extremely important.

Mr. MOLINARI. I thank the gentleman for her contribution. I think the gentleman raised some very good points.

In the remaining time, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that today Prime Minister Lange was in this country. As a matter of fact, he was on "NBC Today" this morning. His position, as he articulated, was very inflexible on the issue.

We have been friends of the people of New Zealand for a good many years. I hope that we can get back to that type of friendship and the spirit of cooperation that has existed for so very long.

He did say one thing today that bothered me, however. He said, in reference to New Zealand, "We have paid our dues. We have fought with the U.S. in four major wars."

Well, we certainly appreciate that support. But I think this country has paid its dues, too, and we do not look at the past as saying, "That's enough. We are not going to make any further contributions to the free nations of the world."

I hope, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Lange spends his last few hours in this country that he receives this message from Congress, that he understands that we are concerned, that he understands also that we want to resume our true friendship. We want them back as allies as they have been since the ANZUS Treaty started in 1951.

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all commend my good friend from New York for his initiative in calling this special order today about a subject that is of great concern to us all. For whenever an alliance of free countries is threatened, the interests of free people throughout the world are likewise imperiled.

And that is the issue before us: The continuity and solidarity of the ANZUS alliance is jeopardized by the unilateral and ill-advised actions taken by the Government of New Zealand. Those actions are particularly distressing because of the long and friendly relations between our two countries, a relationship that began in the 1790's when New Zealand was one of the first Pacific Ocean countries with which the newly-independent United States began trading.

Ironically, given the present problem, it was the Prime Minister of New Zealand in 1942 who initiated the idea of a "Pacific Pact" that would serve to bring the United States into a closer relationship with our friends and allies in the South Pacific. That pact

became a reality in 1951 when representatives of the United States, Australia, and New Zealand signed the ANZUS Security Treaty in San Francisco.

The treaty binds its three signatories to consult together "whenever in the opinion of any of them the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of any of the parties is threatened in the Pacific." Since 1951, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand have conducted combined military exercises, shared intelligence data, and developed other political and military exchanges.

Until the recent statements and actions by Prime Minister Lange in New Zealand, the United States had every reason to believe that the ANZUS alliance was satisfactory to all concerned. Indeed, only last June, Assistant Secretary of State Paul Wolfowitz restated the long-established policy of the United States that "Australians and New Zealanders should rest assured that if an emergency confronts them, the American system is capable of decisive action—and willing to render it."

But such is the internal factionalism of the Labour Party in New Zealand that its leader, David Lange, felt obliged to cast his lot with the antinuclear zealots. Not placated by success in the national elections last July and seemingly oblivious to the larger imperatives placed upon the party by the responsibilities of governing, the Labour Party Conference passed a resolution in September calling for the outright withdrawal of New Zealand from ANZUS. A further raft of resolutions called for the virtual dismantling of New Zealand's strategic relationships with Singapore, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

These resolutions do not bind the party to any one course of action or policy, but they do offer significant indications of where the governing party in New Zealand is heading—a direction that prompted one opposition leader to question whether the Labour government was actually in favor of turning New Zealand into a Third World country.

And now we come to the decision enforced this month: a denial of port access to the U.S.S. *Buchanan*, a conventionally powered U.S. destroyer. In response, the United States has canceled several joint military exercises planned with New Zealand.

Let there be no mistake: New Zealand is our friend. And our Government rejects any punitive sanctions or other such pressures as a retaliation for New Zealand's decisions. But let us also be clear: a friend and ally, such as New Zealand, cannot continue to abuse its relationship with us and not expect a natural course of events to issue in serious and perhaps lasting damage to the political and economic

links that bind our two countries together.

I hope that the Government of New Zealand will reconsider the ill-conceived and shortsighted policy toward the United States and the ANZUS alliance that has thus far been implemented. I can summarize my concerns this way:

First, a denial of port access stikes at the heart of ANZUS. The South Pacific is a maritime region. Free passage on the high seas is the lifeblood of all the countries there. A disruption of the normal relationship that New Zealand has heretofore enjoyed with the United States can only result in an adverse effect on the long-range interests of New Zealand itself. No matter how politicians may like to posture in front of domestic constituencies, the fact cannot be changed that New Zealand is free because America keeps the sealanes open. And for New Zealand to close its ports to those very ships that are guaranteeing its own security is as shortsighted as it is stupid. And it is an action wholly unkeeping with the behavior that is expected of allies.

Second, unilateral actions, no matter how well-intentioned, are never the answer. Every one of us can sympathize with the concerns that New Zealanders have about nuclear weapons—and, with or without ANZUS, we devote a far greater proportion of our resources to defense than does New Zealand.

But, let's get the thing straight: Collective security arrangements, of which ANZUS is one, have kept the peace for nearly 40 years. No country can opt out of such a responsibility without ultimately paying the price. Unilateralism is tempting—but ultimately self-defeating. We share New Zealand's concern about nuclear weapons—and that is exactly why President Reagan is trying to negotiate arms control agreements that will actually reduce the number of such weapons in the world. For too long, we have had arms control agreements that did nothing more than have the effect of intensifying and expanding the arms race. We cannot go that way any longer—and nobody understands that better than Ronald Reagan.

So this is the time for all of us allies, as free men and women, to be standing together. We must reject the quick-fixes that are the false promise of unilateralism.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that our concerns, the expressions being voiced in this special order today, will not fall on deaf ears. We value and respect New Zealand as a friend and ally. We want nothing more than to continue the fruitful relationship that both sides have enjoyed for nearly 200 years. And so I am confident that our voices today will help serve to restore the good relations between our two

countries and will help to uphold the ANZUS alliance and all that it represents.●

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Lange of New Zealand recently swung a wrecking ball at the ANZUS alliance by refusing to allow American warships to use New Zealand ports.

Specifically, he will not allow American Navy vessels carrying nuclear weapons to visit New Zealand ports, and he insists on knowing which ships carry such arms so he can apply the ban. Since we do not announce what weapons are carried on our ships, the ban applies to all of our warships.

The right honorable gentleman says he still wants to be part of the ANZUS alliance. On the record of his recent deeds, that is hard to believe.

I would remind Mr. Lange that the free nations of the world remain free because of association with the United States in defensive alliances that deter aggression. Does Mr. Lange want security for New Zealand in the ANZUS alliance? If he bars our Navy ships from visiting his ports, then the question arises as to why our Navy should be committed to the defense of his island nation.

If his actions are those of an ally, then there must be some new and unprecedented confusion about the definition of the term "ally." I wonder why he doesn't declare New Zealand to be neutral in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

If he no longer considers New Zealand to be part of the regional defense alliance and the defensive structure of the free world, then he should say so directly, because that is the effect of what he is doing.

It is fatuous for him to say he wants to be part of the alliance while he refuses to allow U.S. Navy ships to use his ports.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

A POLITICAL TIME BOMB COULD THREATEN THE ARMS TALKS IN GENEVA

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take the full 60 minutes and I am sure that both the staff and any colleagues in the Chamber will breathe a sigh of relief.

But what I would like to talk on for a few minutes again this evening, as I did on yesterday, is what I would refer to as a political time bomb that could threaten the arms limitation talks that are scheduled for Geneva on March 12.

This time bomb is one that I do not believe many people are aware of, but when the Congress concluded its action on the Defense authorization bill and the Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1985, they devised a rather unusual procedure with respect to the MX missile which has seen a somewhat checkered history being supported on several votes one year and being knocked down by one or two votes on subsequent years.

That decision was that \$1.5 billion would be allocated for the production of 21 MX missiles in fiscal year 1985 provided that that money was fenced in unable to be used until early in March. There were taken in the House and in the Senate some four affirmative votes in connection with the MX. Two votes in the House, first of all, to authorize this money. And, second, to appropriate the money. Two votes in the Senate to authorize the money and to appropriate the money. Only if those four votes all came out in favor of the MX would the money then be unfenced and the production of that missile could proceed.

What this means, of course, with the rather checkered history of MX support in this body and in the other body that a single negative vote in either this House or the other body could wipe out the MX missile and leave us without any comparable missile in our inventory.

The Soviet Union with its SS-18 and its SS-19 has, as President Reagan has already pointed out, some 800 MX-type of missiles which are available and which are extremely accurate and which have, in fact, far more explosive power than anything that we have in our arsenal today.

The date for these votes is expected to come probably in the middle of next week because this is not only the schedule that has been outlined in this rather complicated arrangement legislatively approved last year, but the votes will be also occurring just on the eve of what has appeared to be the most encouraging opportunity that we have had for a meaningful and effective and verifiable arms negotiations.

□ 1720

So if the MX missile were to be defeated either in the House or in the Senate, we might as well call off the negotiations in Geneva, because what we will be doing, in the event that Congress has rejected the MX missile in spite of the appeal of the President of the United States that we would be giving away a major part of an American defense capability without the

Soviet Union having to make any single concession at all, and clearly if they recognize that even before the American delegates have sat down around the table in Geneva to negotiate that we have given up one of the strongest cards in our playing hand, there is no real need to worry about negotiations because the Americans apparently do not really want to enter into serious negotiations or hard negotiations, they are willing to give up even without a fight.

I want to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland, who is the chairman of the panel in the Armed Services Procurement Subcommittee on Arms Negotiations, and she has, in fact, been not only a strong supporter of arms negotiations but has also recognized the importance of these positive votes on the MX in connection with what would hopefully emerge from Geneva.

Mrs. BYRON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I join with my colleague in concern about where we are going right now with the critical vote that is going to be coming up next month, and I think to look at that vote we have to look back in history a little bit, and we do not have to go very far back in history, but we must go back and look at the strength of our NATO allies. We must go back and look at the decision that was made just 7 short years ago when we had a commitment to deploy the GLCM and the Pershing missiles which were American weapon systems, but both of those are deployed on our NATO allies. And at the same time we are looking to a modernization of our own missile systems, as we have done with the development, as we have gone through the development of the MX.

We have had some shaky times in that development stage, but we also are now at the brink, and I have to say that I was not a great proponent of the MX just 3 or 4 short years ago, when I had a great deal of personal trouble with the fact that we had no basing mode. We now have come up with a basing mode.

There are questions about the hardening aspect of the silos, but I think, having looked at all of the other options, this is the only option that we currently have. And going a little bit farther than that, how can we ask our NATO allies to deploy our new weapons systems on their land when we are not willing on our own time to modernize our weapons systems. I think this plays very strongly into the scenario.

Looking once again to those individuals who have had the responsibility over the last several years in Geneva to debate and to negotiate with the Russians, just a year ago in October, when negotiations broke off with the

initial deployment of the GLCM's and the Pershings, we thought that it would be the end of negotiations. As it turned out, the Russians did not leave the negotiating table until December. Those negotiations were supposed to almost wind down in December, but it was within a 2-week timeframe when the Russians, so to speak, walked out.

We have had a tremendous breakthrough back in this January when a new team being led by the Secretary of State went to Geneva to open up some new brand of negotiations. Once again we are getting back to the table.

I have felt you cannot resolve problems unless you speak to one another, and unless we speak to one another we cannot begin to resolve these serious problems that we are undertaking. And for us now, when we are just getting back to the bargaining table, when we are just getting back to a dialog, to once again eliminate or fence off or cut out a program on which we have had several of our initial test shots and they have all been absolutely superior shots, they have all done exactly as they were designed to do, we have moved forward in that factor, so I think now is not the time to eliminate a program on which we have spend a great deal of time in the development stage.

I want to commend my colleague for taking this special order to begin to address the issue that is one on which this body is going to have only 10 hours of debate, an up or down vote on a program that has been fenced since last fall.

Mr. STRATTON. Is it not the case that earlier, a year or so ago, we emphasized that a vote for the MX missile would represent a further type of arms limitation agreement because of our decision that once the MX missile was in production we would also approach a new venture, which was called the Midgetman missile, a single warhead rather than a 10-warhead missile, which would be mobile and therefore have a much larger factor of invulnerability? And if we approve the MX, the Midgetman program will then be continued, will it not?

Mrs. BYRON. It is my understanding that that is the case. I question the individuals who are trying to eliminate the MX program per se but said that they were solidly in favor of Midgetman. And what concerns me is if we eliminate MX and we move forward with Midgetman, where are those same colleagues of ours going to be when we start looking at the dollar cost and the personnel cost of a Midgetman program? And I think that that is a factor that we have to take into consideration, and we have to get some kind of an understanding out of those people who are trying to eliminate a system for another system. Are they going to be there when it comes time for that other system? I think we are

now on the brink of a development stage where it has moved ahead, where the MX has continued in its development phase. We have had a request for 21 missiles in last year's authorization. I think the time has come that we are going to have to make the hard decision whether we are really committed to negotiations or whether we are not.

Mr. STRATTON. In fact, if I recall, it was the new chairman of our committee, the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], who had pointed out and had taken the initiative in adding this arms control aspect to the MX, with the assistance of the Midgetman, that this would really be a step forward toward arms limitation, could conceivably even be something that we would encourage the Soviet Union to emulate rather than continuing to have large numbers of warheads in one missile, perhaps the Soviets might follow our lead and also have one-warhead missile rather than 10-warhead missiles.

Mrs. BYRON. When you look at the leaps and bounds that the Soviets have gone with their modernization programs, in the same timeframe when we have not modernized, I think there is no question that we must move ahead to some type.

Hopefully, we will not have to deploy, hopefully we will not have to move forward in that, because we will be able to come up with some type of an arms control agreement, but until that arms control agreement is within reach and within a reality, I see no other alternative except to move ahead with the commitment that we have made.

□ 1730

Mr. STRATTON. Well, I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for joining in this debate, and we have a few days ahead of us, and I hope that we will be able to convince our colleagues that this is the proper way to go, to support the MX missile.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE INTERSTATE BANKING ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Interstate Banking Act of 1985, a bill to phase in interstate banking, protect against excess concentration in the banking industry, and mandate that banks moving into new communities improve the service available to local banking customers. I am sponsoring the bill in the belief that Congress must modernize our banking laws, and in the conviction

that it is now possible to develop a consensus about how the Congress should handle the transition to full interstate banking.

MARKETPLACE EVOLUTION

Since the Congress last addressed the broad question of interstate banking in 1956, we have seen high and volatile interest rates, consumers' growing awareness and sensitivity to financial market products, and dramatic developments in technology that have contributed to the awareness by bankers that laws limiting bank movements across State lines are no longer workable.

Because the financial services industry has become increasingly fragmented, with a host of new providers, banks face competition in every business line. A consumer who wants a high rate of return on savings can choose between a bank, a retailer like Sears or J.C. Penney, or a brokerage firm like Merrill-Lynch. The larger corporate customer no longer goes automatically to the bank for funds. Many go directly to the capital markets, utilizing the service of investment bankers, or use banks abroad, or deal with large finance companies or insurers. In the trust business, banks face competition from insurers and money managers. In the mortgage business, banks, thrifts, financial conglomerates and mortgage banking firms struggle over the same market.

The most astonishing thing about this intense competition is that it has developed virtually overnight. When I came to the Congress 10 years ago, interest rates were regulated. Bank lines of business were quietly protected. And, most consumers never thought of banking further away than their own neighborhood. Nationally, credit card systems were in their childhood or early adolescence.

Over the last decade we in Congress have had to respond to dramatic changes in the financial services industry. We enacted major legislation in 1978, in 1980, and again in 1982, each time in an effort to equalize competition within the banking industry and between banks and their competitors. Yet, competitive inequities still remain.

Every bank competitor can follow customers across State lines, building branches and offering a variety of products beyond the basic savings and transaction services. In fact, I once was told that everyone in the continental U.S. lived within 75 miles of a Merrill-Lynch office. Certainly that is now true of Sears or Prudential.

Bankers, recognizing this problem of access, have done their best to avoid interstate restrictions. State and Federal legislators have responded to such movements by gradually stretching the borders drawn by the 1933 McFadden Act and the 1956 Douglas Amend-

ment to the Bank Holding Company Act. Erosion of interstate barriers mean that banks now cross State borders to offer particular kinds of services or to rescue failing institutions.

Permit me to show how such movement is legally permissible. First, States are authorized to allow banks to move across State lines. Many are doing so. Second, the Garn-St Germain Act of 1982 allows interstate acquisitions of failing institutions. Third, the Bank Holding Company Act allows banks to own nonbank subsidiaries in other States. Fourth, certain bank functions can be carried out through specialized loan production and Edge Act offices. And fifth, near-banks, such as savings and loans and mutual savings banks are not statutorily prohibited from moving. In fact, a New Jersey savings and loan has recently applied to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to establish a nationwide branch network.

Moreover, in recent years, a new avoidance technique—the nonbank-bank loophole—has been untouched by the Congress. The result of inaction on that issue is that banks (and their nonbank owners) will be allowed to set up a physical presence to do banking businesses that increasingly do not need a physical presence to undertake. Think of credit cards, CD's sold interstate, savings accounts and money funds that are advertised and accepted interstate.

INTERSTATE BANKING THROUGH REGIONAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. Speaker, I should elaborate for a moment on how our nationwide banking system is developing, and why I think it is so important for Congress to assume an oversight role in the process.

There are two essential issues to be addressed when we consider moving to full interstate banking. First, what should we do to ensure the continuing stability of the banking system? And second, accepting that the structure of the system is a matter of important public interest, how do we protect the consumer and maintain the economic benefits of a competitive banking structure?

On the issue of a stable banking structure, it is no longer news that banks are failing at a greater rate than anytime since the depression. We had 79 commercial bank failures in 1984; the FDIC expects 100 in 1985. There are currently 800 banks on the regulators' problem list; that number could rise to over 1,000 this year.

Such weakness in the banking industry has taken place because of a variety of factors. Interest rate volatility and heated marketplace competition have made banking a tougher business than it used to be, and some institutions have failed from simple bad management. Some have invested too heavily in businesses like energy or

real estate and have floundered as inflation-driven values tumbled. Others, over-invested in low-return, long-term assets, haven't been able to maintain earnings as the price of funds has gone up. There are also more generic reasons—reasons related to our current legal structure.

The fact is that many banks are going through costly and inefficient gymnastics to keep and acquire new customers. In effect, they are practicing loophole manipulation rather than sound business planning. Because their market share has decreased in the face of intense competition, banks are leveraging their capital at greater rates, stretching themselves to create a better earnings profile. And, in States like Illinois, where even in-state branching has been restricted, bankers are depending on high-cost, highly volatile purchased funds, rather than developing a more stable extended deposit base.

The banking system in the United States, tied as it is to outdated structural arrangements and buffeted by the vagaries of a mercurial market, is certainly more fragile than at any time since the depression. In fact, our system is now less stable than any in the industrialized world.

One way to strengthen the system is to adapt our legal framework to today's marketplace. Banks urgently need the opportunity to diversify and move into new market areas and services. It simply does not make sense for a community bank in Washington, DC to be precluded from competing in the suburban markets of Maryland and Virginia. And it is not acceptable that a New York money-center bank can open offices in Zurich, London, and Hong Kong, but not in Newark or Princeton.

Mr. Speaker, the advent of electronic funds transfer and the creativity of the legal profession ensure that aggressively managed institutions will broaden their markets. Many institutions will fail; some quite dramatically. But some will succeed—some are succeeding—to move interstate at great profit. Thus, the question we must now ask is this: What do these individual successes mean for the economy and for the public?

Many people in the banking industry and many policymakers have figured out that lowering interstate barriers can be good for local banks and local markets. Those people are determined to promote interstate banking, but let's look at how they're doing it.

Utilizing the concept of regional compacts, the States are acting in concert to carve up America. If the compacts are allowed to develop freely, it is expected that within a few years, most States will belong to regional groupings that allow bank movement only across select State lines.

The problems with such arrangements are numerous. First, of course, the groupings may be found to be unconstitutional. Second, these compacts can create a process of selective enrichment. In New England, for example, bank stock rose in 1982 at a rate seven times the national increase, simply because it appeared that a regional compact would be authorized. Third, the regions being created are artificially determined, and have little relation to natural market areas. In the Northeast, for example, New York would be excluded from compacts in such a way that a New Jersey or Connecticut commuter would be unable to fully utilize its bank's services several miles from home, while a resident of Maine could travel hundreds of miles to Connecticut and find a branch of his hometown bank. In the West, Utah residents could find their bank in Alaska, but not in California, because California would be excluded from the regional arrangement. Imagine such limitations on other products—automobiles from Michigan being prohibited in Florida, or wheat from Iowa limited to consumer use in 11 Western States. Preposterous!

Fourth, and most importantly, regional compacts will ultimately endanger our national market system and hurt the consumer. Thus, the potential benefit of interstate banking would become a liability in a system of regional compacts. Instead of a vibrant, responsive national banking system we could end-up with fiefdoms, where single regional institutions are protected from competition. In some States excluded from compacts—those black holes in the national map of colorful regional groupings—retail customers and borrowers could face a dangerous weakening of local institutions because those banks were excluded from opportunities to expand and diversify.

Regional compacts, in my view, will undermine the ability of the national economy to grow efficiently and will limit consumer choices. Federal Reserve Chairman Paul Volcker, who fears the Balkanization of banking through the compact movement, has suggested that any authorization for such agreements should be for a strictly limited period, and viewed as a transition toward interstate banking. My proposal, the Interstate Banking Act of 1985, takes that approach.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Congress now has a window of opportunity to shape the Nation's banking system for the coming generation. The opening is a narrow one, because in very quick order marketplace activity will have determined the shape of the system for many years to come. The structure of the banking system is an issue of national interest, and it is

an issue we need to take up immediately.

Chairman Volcker has said that the questions of regional compacts and interstate banking should be decided by Congress—not, he points out, “by regulators or courts attempting to read the legislature’s intent into old laws originally intended to deal with different problems.”

Congress last considered the question of interstate banking in 1956—almost 30 years ago. That year, the Douglas Amendment to the Bank Holding Company Act was approved. Before that, in 1927 and 1933, Congress took action that had the result, although not the intent, of establishing state boundaries as the outside limits for branching commercial banks. No legislation, however, has ever statutorily limited the branching power of thrift institutions, or distinguished from commercial banks.

Passage of the 1927 McFadden Act and its 1933 amendment established the principle that banks chartered under either State or Federal authority would be treated equally with regard to branching within the States, and the States would have the power to regulate the movement of banks within their borders. In 1956, after bankers developed the holding company form of organization to escape branching restrictions by establishing or purchasing new banks rather than opening branches, Congress approved the Douglas amendment. That amendment prohibits companies from acquiring banks in another State unless the State authorizes the acquisition.

There are two reasons that I point to the history of interstate banking restrictions. The first is to demonstrate the Congress has reserved for itself a role in shaping the Nation’s banking structure. Second, Congress has usually acted to verify marketplace developments. McFadden, for example, broadened the branching authority of national banks to match that of banks in States that allowed intracity branching. The 1933 amendment recognized and countenanced branching throughout States, and in 1956 the Congress legitimized and regulated the practice of banks establishing subsidiary businesses in other states.

Mr. Speaker, marketplace developments since 1956 require that Congress again assume the responsibility of arbitrating and overseeing the movement of banks across State lines. In fact, it is a responsibility we should have assumed earlier.

Several years ago, I introduced a package of bills offering a variety of proposals for managing the transition to interstate banking. At the time I referred to a 1981 report by the Carter administration entitled “Geographical Restrictions on Commercial Banking in the United States.” The report has called existing geographical restric-

tions anachronistic, and had argued that interstate barriers discriminate against consumers, and deprive the public of the benefits of increased competition, impede the efficient allocation of resources, retard the development and applications of new technologies, and restrict the ability of bank management to compete with other nonbank financial institutions playing under a different set of rules.

I agreed with the findings of the report, and suggested several options for Congress to take beginning steps toward full interstate banking. Several of those step I suggested have since been taken, including interstate development of ATM’s and authorization for depository institutions to acquire failing banks and thrifts across State lines. I should mention that because Congress never acted explicitly to countenance interstate ATM networks, a recent court case has questioned their continuance.

Though I hoped for a comprehensive review of interstate issues, I noted that “the tendency of government is to wait for a crisis before addressing a problem.” Well, Mr. Speaker, that crisis is here. We face increasing fragility in the banking structure and the possible economic Balkanization of America.

It is now critical for the Congress to act on this issue.

THE INTERSTATE BANKING ACT

Mr. Speaker, in proposing the Interstate Banking Act of 1985, I am advocating the position that allowing depository institutions to compete nationwide will contribute to the stability of the banking system and improve service to the consumer.

I recognize, however, that there are legitimate concerns about dramatic change in our national banking system. Some argue that eliminating interstate restrictions will result in a monopolistic banking system, with several large institutions controlling a majority of depository institution assets. I don’t think that will happen. Nevertheless I am proposing enactment of certain safeguards to ensure that financial concentration will not occur.

First, my bill would allow interstate branching as well as regulate cross-border mergers and acquisitions. In terms of public policy, I believe it is better to encourage internal growth by allowing branching than by encouraging growth through mergers and acquisitions. A recent Federal Reserve study has shown that the most merger-active States have been those with the most restrictive branching laws. In other words, when the branching option is unavailable, geographic expansion will occur more often in a manner that increases financial concentration.

When institutions do agree to mergers and purchases, my bill limits the

prospects for financial concentration in two ways. First, in order to strengthen the regulators’ ability to preserve the competitiveness of local banking markets, my bill directs the overseeing regulator to prohibit a merger or acquisition which will result in an undue concentration of resources. Further, no merger or acquisition can be approved if the acquiring institution has more than \$10 billion in domestic deposits and the institution to be purchased has more than \$2 billion in domestic deposits. The net effect of these numbers is that the 20 largest institutions will not be able to combine with any of the 50 largest.

Another concern expressed by opponents of interstate banking is that as banks begin to move into new communities they will strip the community of its resources or reduce the level of services as a cost-savings measure. My bill will make a determination of consumer benefit an integral part of the merger approval process. It will ensure, therefore, that combinations of institutions not only make sense from a business perspective, but also offer identifiable benefits to the consumers and communities affected.

Under the Interstate Banking Act, overseeing regulators must examine the record of the acquiring institution and its subsidiaries in meeting the needs of the communities it already serves, and then determine that the new community will benefit from (a) reduced rates and fees for existing services, (b) new or improved service in the community, (c) increased operating efficiency, or (d) greater convenience. Only after such a finding can a merger or acquisition be approved.

With regard to the actual phase-in of interstate banking, my bill covers both commercial banking and thrift institutions, and allows a temporary period in which regional compacts could exist. For a period of 3 years after the date of enactment, States could regulate entry according to regional geography, reciprocal treatment by other States, or by any other similar conditions. During the period States may, of course, authorize entry without restriction.

If a State determines to regulate entry according to regional geography, it will be required to accept banks from any State which is (a) contiguous and (b) offers reciprocal treatment of banks and thrifts from the acting State. This rule applies both to interstate branching and expansion by acquisition, and it is included to ensure that any region created under the act is designed according to some geographic logic. Bank and thrift customers would be much better served by a system which recognizes that State borders are political barriers which are crossed at will and regularly, by people living near them.

After the original 3-year period, States which have opened their borders to banks and thrifts from other States will be required to allow entry by institutions from States which have a law providing for reciprocal treatment of the acting State's banks and thrifts. In this second phase of the move to interstate banking, I expect regional arrangements to be gradually replaced by more open systems which reflect the existence of a national marketplace for financial services.

At the fifth anniversary of the enactment of the Interstate Banking Act of 1985 we would move to full interstate banking, and even those States which had not taken action to manage the transition would be required to open their borders.

Mr. Speaker, activity at the State level and recent announcements by major banking trade associations—the Association of Bank Holding Companies and the American Bankers Association—that they are ready to support a move to full interstate banking, indicate that the time is ripe for Congress to address this long-overlooked issue. I believe my proposal offers a logical system for managing the transition to a more open, competitive, and stable banking environment.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the Interstate Banking Act of 1985 proposes a solution to the interstate banking question which recognizes recent changes in the banking industry. It allows local input regarding the transition to a national marketplace, establishes parity between banks and thrifts regarding their interstate movement, prevents financial concentration, and ensures that banking consumers benefit from interstate movement. After almost 30 years of inaction, it is now time for Congress to address these crucial issues.

The text of the Interstate Banking Act of 1985 follows:

H.R. 1276

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Interstate Banking Act of 1985".

INTERSTATE BRANCHING BY NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 5155(c) of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 36(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" before "(2)"; and
(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (3) within any other State if under the statute laws of the State in which the association is seeking to establish such branch, State banks located in the State in which the association is located are expressly authorized to establish such branches. In determining whether or to what extent to permit the establishment or operation of a branch by a bank the principal place of business of which is in another State, a State may allow such branching (A) without restriction, or (B) on the basis of (i) the location of the States involved, (ii) laws providing for reciprocal treatment of banks located in its State, or (iii) other similar conditions or restrictions. In any case in which a State has in effect,

on any date during the first three years after the date of the enactment of this sentence, a statute law which permits the establishment of branches by banks located in the same region in which such State is located, such State shall (A) after the effective date of such State statute law, permit the establishment of branches by out-of-State banks located in any State which (i) is contiguous to such State, and (ii) has statute laws providing for reciprocal treatment of banks located in such State, and (B) beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this sentence, permit the establishment of branches by banks located in any State which has a statute law providing for reciprocal treatment of banks located in such State."

(b)(1) Section 5155(c) of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 36(c)) is amended by striking out "(3) within any other" and all that follows through "banks located in such State," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) at any point within any State in which said association is not situated, if such establishment and operation are at the time authorized to State banks of such State by the statute law of such State in question by language specifically granting such authority affirmatively and not merely by implication or recognition, and subject to the restrictions as to location imposed by the law of such State on its State banks."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

INTERSTATE ACQUISITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(d)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the first sentence as paragraph (1);

(2) by redesignating the second sentence as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

"(2)(A) For purposes of this section, a State may authorize a bank holding company, the banking operations of which are principally conducted in another State, to acquire, directly or indirectly, voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of a bank located in such State.
"(B) In determining whether and to what extent to permit such an acquisition by such a bank holding company, a State may, by law, allow such an acquisition—
"(i) without restriction; or
"(ii) on the basis of—
"(I) the location of the States involved;
"(II) laws providing for the reciprocal treatment of bank holding companies located in its State; or
"(III) other similar conditions or restrictions."
"(C) In any case in which a State has in effect, on any date during the first three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, a law which permits an acquisition described in subparagraph (A) by a bank holding company located in the same region in which such State is located, such State shall—
"(i) after the effective date of such State law, permit such an acquisition by any out-of-State bank holding company located in any State which—
"(I) is contiguous to such State; and
"(II) has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of bank holding companies located in such State; and
"(ii) beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, permit such an acquisition by any out-of-State bank holding company located in any

State which has a law providing for the reciprocal treatment of bank holding companies located in such State.

"(3) No application may be approved under this section unless—

(A) on the day on which such application is submitted to the Board, the subsidiaries of the bank holding company involved have less than \$10,000,000,000 of domestic deposits and the bank which is to be acquired has less than \$2,000,000,000 in domestic deposits;

"(B) the acquisition will not result in an undue concentration of resources; and

"(C) after examining the proposed acquisition and the record of the acquiring bank holding company and its subsidiaries in meeting the needs of the communities which it serves, the Board determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that approval of the application will result in—

"(I) reduced rates and fees for existing services;

"(II) new or improved services in the community;

"(III) increased operating efficiency; or

"(IV) greater convenience."

(b)(1) Section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

MERGERS BY INSURED BANKS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 18(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(c)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (6) through (12) as paragraphs (7) through (13), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6)(A) The responsible agency shall not approve any proposed merger transaction which would result in an insured bank operating branches in more than one State unless such transaction is authorized by the laws of the States in which the branches will be operated.
"(B) In determining whether and to what extent to permit such a merger, a State may, by law, allow such a transaction—
"(i) without restriction, or
"(ii) on the basis of—
"(I) the location of the States involved;
"(II) laws providing for the reciprocal treatment of banks located in its State; or
"(III) other similar conditions or restrictions."
"(C) In any case in which a State has in effect on any date during the first three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, a law which permits a merger described in subparagraph (A) but limits such mergers to States located in the same region in which such State is located, such State shall—
"(i) after the effective date of such State law, permit such a merger by any out-of-State bank located in any State which—
"(I) is contiguous to such State; and
"(II) has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of banks located in such State; and
"(ii) beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, permit such a merger by any out-of-State bank located in any State which has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of banks located in such State.
"(D) The responsible agency shall not approve—

"(i) any proposed merger transaction under subparagraph (A) if—

"(I) on the date on which the approval of the responsible agency is requested, such acquiring bank has more than \$10,000,000,000 of domestic deposits and the bank which is to be acquired has more than \$2,000,000,000 of domestic deposits; or

"(II) the merger will result in an undue concentration of resources; or

"(ii) any proposed merger transaction under subparagraph (C) unless the responsible agency determines, after examining the proposed merger transaction and the record of the acquiring bank in meeting the needs of the communities which it serves, that there is a reasonable likelihood that approval of the proposed merger transaction would result in—

"(I) reduced rates and fees for existing services;

"(II) new or improved services in the community;

"(III) increased operating efficiency; or

"(IV) greater convenience."

(b)(1) Section 18(c)(6) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(c)(6)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking out "under subparagraph (A)";

(B) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking out "under subparagraph (C)"; and

(C) by striking out subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (A).

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

INTERSTATE BRANCHING BY THRIFTS

SEC. 5. (a) Section 5(r) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(r)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting "or" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(B) by striking out subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) The limitations of paragraph (1) shall not apply if the law of the State in which the branch is to be located would permit establishment of the branch were the association an institution of the savings and loan or savings bank type chartered by the State in which its home office is located.

"(B) In determining whether or to what extent to permit the establishment or operation of a branch by a savings and loan association or savings bank the principal place of business of which is in another State, a State may allow such branching—

"(i) without restriction; or

"(ii) on the basis of—

"(I) the location of the States involved;

"(II) laws providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations and savings banks located in its States; or

"(III) other similar conditions or restrictions.

"(C) In any case in which a State has in effect, on any date during the first three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, a law which permits the establishment of branches by savings and loan associations and savings banks located in the same region in which such State is located, such State shall—

"(i) after the effective date of such State law, permit the establishment of branches

by out-of-State savings and loan associations and savings banks located in any State which—

"(I) is contiguous to such State; and

"(II) has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations and savings banks located in such State; and

"(ii) beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, permit the establishment of branches by savings and loan associations and savings banks located in any State which has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations and savings banks located in such State."

(b)(1) Section 5(r) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(r)) is hereby repealed.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

INTERSTATE ACQUISITIONS BY THRIFTS

SEC. 6. Section 407 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(s)(1)(A) MERGERS INVOLVING MORE THAN ONE STATE.—In considering a reorganization or merger involving an insured institution the principal places of business of which are located in different States, the Corporation shall permit any such reorganization or merger if the laws of the States in which such insured institutions are principally located expressly permit such a reorganization or merger involving insured institutions located in the States involved or permit the establishment or operation of branch offices in the State involved.

"(B) In determining whether or to what extent to permit such a merger or reorganization or establishment or operation of a branch office by an insured institution the principal location of which is in another State, a State may permit such merger or reorganization or establishment of a branch office—

"(i) without restriction; or

"(ii) on the basis of—

"(I) the location of the States involved;

"(II) laws providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations located in its State; or

"(III) other similar conditions or restrictions.

"(C) In any case in which a State has in effect, on any date during the first three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, a law which permits a merger described in subparagraph (A) but limits such mergers to States located in the same region in which such State is located, such State shall—

"(i) after the effective date of such State law, permit such a merger by out-of-State savings and loan associations located in any State which—

"(I) is contiguous to such State; and

"(II) has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations located in such State; and

"(ii) beginning three years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, permit such a merger by out-of-State savings and loan associations located in any State which has a law providing for reciprocal treatment of savings and loan associations located in such State.

"(2)(A) The Corporation shall not approve any merger under this subsection unless—

"(i) on the date on which the approval of the Corporation is requested, the acquiring savings and loan association has less than \$10,000,000,000 of domestic deposits and the

savings and loan association which is to be acquired has less than \$2,000,000,000 of domestic deposits;

"(ii) the merger will not result in an undue concentration of resources; and

"(iii) after examining the proposed merger and the record of the acquiring savings and loan association in meeting the needs of the communities which it serves, the Corporation determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that approval of the proposed merger would result in—

"(i) reduced rates and fees for existing services;

"(ii) new or improved services in the community;

"(iii) increased operating efficiency; or

"(iv) greater convenience."

INTERSTATE ACQUISITIONS BY SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANIES

SEC. 7. (a) Section 408(e)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730a(e)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3)(A) Not later than 60 days after registering under this section, each savings and loan holding company shall submit a written notice to the corporation designating the State in which the principal savings and loan business of such savings and loan holding company is located.

"(B) The Corporation may allow a savings and loan holding company whose operations are principally conducted in a State to acquire, directly or indirectly, any voting shares of, interest in, or all or substantially all of the assets of any association located in another State, if the laws of such State expressly permit such acquisition.

"(C) In determining whether and to what extent to permit such an acquisition by such a savings and loan holding company, a State may, by law, allow such an acquisition—

"(i) Without restriction; or

"(ii) on the basis of—

"(I) the location of the States involved;

"(II) laws providing for the reciprocal treatment of savings and loan holding companies located in its State; or

"(III) other similar conditions or restrictions.

"(D) The Corporation shall not approve any application under this subsection unless—

"(i) on the day on which such application is submitted to the Corporation, the subsidiaries of the savings and loan holding company involved have less than \$10,000,000,000 of domestic deposits and the savings and loan association which is to be acquired has less than \$2,000,000,000 of domestic deposits;

"(ii) the merger will not result in an undue concentration of resources; and

"(iii) after examining the proposed acquisition and the record of the acquiring savings and loan holding company and its subsidiaries in meeting the needs of the communities which it serves, the Corporation determines that there is a reasonable likelihood that approval of the application would result in—

"(I) reduced rates and fees for existing services;

"(II) new or improved services in the community;

"(III) increased operating efficiency; or

"(IV) greater convenience."

(b)(1) Section 408(e)(3) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730a(e)(3)) is amended by striking out subparagraphs (B) and (C) and redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (B).

(2) The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT FOR THE 99TH CONGRESS

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 99th Congress in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee in open session on February 6, 1985.

PART I—SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

Scope and Authority

Rule 1. (a) These rules govern the procedures to be followed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"). So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of each subcommittee of the Committee, but each subcommittee may prescribe additional rules not inconsistent therewith.

(b) These rules are adopted under the authority of clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 96th Congress.

PART II—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

Subcommittees

Rule 2. (a) The Chairman may establish subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as he may deem advisable. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties. The Chairman may refer any bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration and may recall any such bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter from the subcommittee to which it was referred.

(b) Any member of the Committee may sit with any subcommittee, but only regular members of the subcommittee may vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

Meetings

Rule 3. (a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month, except when the House is not meeting on that day. When the Chairman determines that there is sufficient reason, he may call a meeting on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chairman determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) Insofar as practicable, notice will be provided seven days in advance of meetings. However, the Chairman may, in his discretion, waive such time period for good cause.

Members Required for Quorums and Committee Action

Rule 4. (a)(1) A quorum of the Committee consists of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(2) A quorum of a subcommittee consists of a majority of the members of the subcommittee.

(b) Except as provided in clause 4(e)(2)(A) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Rep-

resentatives and rules 5, 8, 12, 16, and 17 of the Committee rules, action may be taken by the Committee by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

Broadcasts of Committee Proceedings

Rule 5. (a) Whenever any hearing or meeting by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee may permit, except as provided in clause (b) of this rule, by a vote of a majority 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 such methods of coverage under the following rules:

(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 shall be required against his or her will to be photographed or to otherwise have a graphic reproduction of his or her image made 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 witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio coverage at a hearing, all microphones shall be turned off, at the request of any witness who does not wish to be subjected to television or still photography coverage at a hearing, all lenses shall be covered, and at the request of a witness who does not wish to have a graphic reproduction of his or her image made at a hearing, the making of such a reproduction at the hearing shall not be permitted. This paragraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(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 the other media.

(b) Coverage by radio, television, still cameras, or electronic recording device of any disciplinary hearing held under subpart B of part III of the Committee rules is prohibited.

Committee Records

Rule 6. (a) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of the Committee, establish such procedures as in the Chairman's judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

(b) Unless otherwise authorized by the Committee, no information received by the Committee respecting any alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer,

or employee in the performance of his duties or the discharge of his responsibilities shall be disclosed to the public before the transmittal under rule 11 of the Committee rules of such Member, officer, or employee of a Statement of Alleged Violation in connection with such violation. After the service of such a Statement on the Member, officer, or employee—

(1) the Statement and any other paper filed pursuant to rule 12 of the Committee rules respecting such violation shall be made available for public inspection at reasonable hours, and

(2) any other paper filed with the Committee respecting such violation shall be made available as authorized by the Committee, except that no paper shall be made available if its disclosure would violate any Executive Order or any Federal law or regulation.

Special Procedures

Rule 7. The Committee may adopt by resolution any special procedures deemed necessary to a particular matter before the Committee. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties and witnesses in the matter.

Changes in Committee Rules

Rule 8. The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee if before such vote written notice of the proposed modification, amendment, or repeal was provided each member of the Committee.

PART III—COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

Subpart A—Complaints and committee inquiries

Complaints

Rule 9. (a) A complaint submitted to the Committee under clause 4(e)(2)(B) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be in writing and under oath, setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereafter referred to as the "complainant");

(2) the name and position or title of the Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives alleged to be in violation of the Code of Official Conduct or a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct;

(3) the nature of the alleged violation, including, if possible, the specific section of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct alleged to have been violated; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. When facts are alleged upon the information and belief of the complainant, the complaint shall so state and set forth the basis for such information and belief.

(b) All documents in the possession of the complainant that are relevant to and in support of the allegations shall be appended to the complaint.

(c) A complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee. A complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted through a Member who agrees, in writing, to accept it for that purpose. If a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House is submitted to three Members of the House who refuse, in writing, to transmit the complaint to the Committee, the complainant may transmit the complaint directly to the Committee, provided an affidavit is attached stating, under

oath, the names of the Members to whom the complaint was submitted and by whom it was rejected in writing.

Processing of Complaints

Rule 10. (a)(1) The staff of the Committee shall examine each complaint submitted to the Committee for compliance with clause 4 (e)(2)(B) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule 9 of the Committee rules.

(2) If the staff determines that a complaint does not comply with such House and Committee rules, the complaint shall be returned to the complainant with a general statement that the complaint is not in compliance with such rules and a copy of such rules. A complainant may resubmit a complaint.

(3) If the staff determines that a complaint is in compliance with such House and Committee rules, the complaint shall be filed with the Committee. Within five days of the filing of a complaint (A) a copy of the complaint, showing the date of its filing, shall be transmitted to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee, and (B) every other member of the Committee shall be notified of the filing of the complaint and of its availability for inspection by the member in the Committee offices. Upon the request of any member of the Committee, the staff of the Committee shall inform the member of the complaints which have been filed with the Committee and which are pending before the Committee.

(4) If within thirty days of the date of the filing of a complaint the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee jointly—

(A) decide to place the complaint on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee, it shall be so placed on such agenda, or

(B) determine that the complaint be dismissed because it fails to allege facts which constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or applicable law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct, the complaint together with the determination that it should be dismissed shall be placed on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee.

Unless the Committee determines under clause (b) that the complaint merits further inquiry, the complaint shall be dismissed and the complainant shall be notified of the dismissal. If upon the expiration of such thirty days, the Chairman and ranking minority member have not taken any joint action respecting the complaint, it shall be placed on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee.

(b) At the meeting at which the Committee is to consider a complaint filed with the Committee, the Committee shall determine whether the violation alleged in the complaint is within the jurisdiction of the Committee and, if so, whether the allegations in the complaint merit further inquiry. The complainant and respondent shall be notified, in writing, of action taken by the Committee respecting the complaint.

Preliminary Inquiry and Statement of Alleged Violation

Rule 11. (a)(1) If the Committee determines under rule 10(b) that the allegations of a violation in a complaint filed with the Committee merit further inquiry, the Committee shall conduct a preliminary inquiry

to determine whether such violation occurred.

(2) In the preliminary inquiry—

(A) the Committee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to present to the Committee, orally or in writing, a statement respecting the allegations with respect to which the inquiry is being held,

(B) the staff may interview witnesses and examine documents and other evidentiary matter,

(C) the Committee may order the testimony of witnesses to be taken under oath, in which event the oath may be administered by a member of the Committee or by any person authorized by law to administer oaths,

(D) the Committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things as it deems necessary to the conduct of the inquiry, and

(E) any probative evidence may be used.

Upon the completion of the preliminary inquiry, the staff of the Committee shall prepare and transmit to the Committee a report containing a comprehensive summary of the information received in the inquiry and may include in the report a recommendation for action by the Committee respecting the alleged violation which was the subject of the inquiry.

(b) If the Committee determines on the basis of the report of the Committee staff on the preliminary inquiry respecting an alleged violation that there is reason to believe that the violation occurred, the Committee may direct the staff to transmit to the respondent a Statement of Alleged Violation. A Statement shall be divided into counts and each count shall relate to a separate violation and shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation and include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct alleged to have been violated.

Answers and Motions and Committee Action

Rule 12. (a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted under rule 11(b) of the Committee rules, the respondent receiving the Statement shall have not less than 21 days in which to respond to it. The response shall be by way of answer or motion, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent or his counsel, and shall be limited to the following:

(1) An admission to or denial of, under oath, each count set forth in the Statement. A denial may include (A) negative and affirmative defenses to the allegations in a count, and (B) any supportive evidence and any other relevant information which the respondent may desire to submit.

(2) An objection to any count in the Statement on the grounds that it fails to state facts which constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any other applicable law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct.

(3) An objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(4) A motion for a bill of particulars.

(5) An objection to the participation of any member of the Committee in the consideration of the allegations contained in the Statement on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The Committee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of his qualifications. A

motion under this paragraph is not in lieu of an answer.

Any motion submitted pursuant to this clause shall be accompanied by a memorandum of points and authorities. Except for good cause shown, no pleading or motion not described in paragraphs (1) through (5) will be considered by the Committee and the Committee will not consider any answer or motion described in such paragraphs which is submitted under this clause after the expiration of such 21 days.

(b) Within 30 days after the receipt of any motion under clause (a) respecting a Statement, the Committee shall consider such motion. Notice of the decision of the Committee respecting the motion shall be furnished the respondent who submitted it. When the Committee has acted on all motions submitted under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of clause (a), the respondent shall, in accordance with paragraph (1) of such clause, submit, within 14 days of the date of the last Committee action, an answer to each count in the Statement not dismissed by the Committee.

(c) Failure to submit, within the applicable time period, an answer to a count of a Statement which has not been dismissed by the Committee shall constitute an admission to the violation alleged in the count.

(d) The Chairman, in his discretion, may extend any time limitation imposed by clause (a) or (b) if he determines that the extension would facilitate a fair and complete inquiry and may shorten any such time limitation if he determines that there are special circumstances which require the shortening of such time limitation.

(e)(1) As soon as practicable after the expiration of all applicable time limitations for action under clauses (a) and (b) respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee shall act, by the vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, to—

(A) hold a disciplinary hearing on the violation charged in the Statement, or

(B) defer action on the Statement but only if there is a judicial proceeding pending.

Failure to achieve a vote of the majority of the members of the Committee on a motion to take any action described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall constitute dismissal of the Statement.

(2) The respondent to a Statement of Alleged Violation shall be notified in writing of action taken under paragraph (1) by the Committee respecting the Statement.

Inquiries on the Committee's Initiative

Rule 13. Notwithstanding the absence of a complaint filed with the Committee under rule 10 of the Committee rules, the staff of the Committee shall present to it any evidence available to the staff reasonably indicating that any Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to his conduct in the performance of his duties or in the discharge of his responsibilities. If the Committee determines that the evidence presented by the staff or an alleged violation merits further inquiry, the Committee shall, in accordance with rule 11(a) of the Committee rules, conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether such violation occurred. Rules 11 and 12 of the Committee rules shall apply to further proceedings respecting such alleged violation.

Committee Action After Criminal Convictions

Rule 14. If a Member, officer, or employee of the House is convicted in a Federal, State or local court of a criminal offense for which a sentence of a term of imprisonment of at least one year may be imposed, the Committee shall conduct, in accordance with rule 11(a) of the Committee rules, a preliminary inquiry to review the evidence of such offense and to determine whether it constitutes a violation over which the Committee is given jurisdiction under clause 4(e) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. If on the basis of the report of the Committee staff on the preliminary inquiry the Committee determines that an offense was committed over which the Committee has jurisdiction under such clause, the Committee shall notify the Member, officer, or employee of its determination and shall hold a disciplinary hearing for the sole purpose of determining what action to recommend to the House respecting such offense. Such hearing shall be held in accordance with the requirements of rule 16 of the Committee rules applicable to the second phase of a disciplinary hearing and any recommendation made by the Committee shall be made in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee rules.

Definition

Rule 15. For purposes of this subpart and subpart B, the term "respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House who is charged in a complaint filed with the Committee under rule 10 of the Committee rules or who is charged in a Statement of Alleged Violation transmitted under rule 12 of the Committee rules.

Subpart B—Disciplinary hearings

Disciplinary Hearings

Rule 16. (a) A disciplinary hearing respecting a violation charged in a Statement of Alleged Violation shall be held to receive evidence upon which to base findings of fact and recommendations, if any, to the House respecting such violation. A disciplinary hearing shall consist of two phases. The first phase shall be for the purposes of determining whether or not the counts in the Statement have been provided. The second phase shall be for the purpose of determining what action to recommend to the House with respect to any count found to have been proved.

(b) At a disciplinary hearing the Committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things as it deems necessary. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under Committee direction may be accepted into the Committee record. The procedures set forth in clause 2(k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to disciplinary hearings.

(c) Prior to setting a date for a disciplinary hearing and issuing subpoenas for witnesses, the Committee shall resolve the scope and purpose of the hearing. A copy of this statement of scope and purpose shall be furnished to all witnesses. During the course of the hearing the Committee may expand or contract the scope in light of evidence received.

(d)(1) The order of phase one of a disciplinary hearing shall be as follows:

(A) The Chairman shall open the hearing by stating the Committee's authority to

conduct the hearing, the purpose of the hearing, and its scope.

(B) Testimony from witnesses and other evidence pertinent to the subject of the hearing shall be received in the following order whenever possible: (i) witnesses and other evidence offered by the Committee staff, (ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent, and (iii) rebuttal witnesses.

(C) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by the Committee counsel or authorized staff member. The Committee members may then question the witnesses under the five-minute rule. The respondent or his counsel may then cross-examine the witnesses. Redirect and recross may be permitted in the Chairman's discretion. With respect to witnesses offered by the respondent, a witness shall be examined first by the respondent or his counsel, and then may be cross-examined by Committee counsel or authorized staff member. Committee members may then question the witness under the five-minute rule. Redirect and recross may be permitted in the Chairman's discretion.

(2) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath. The form of the oath shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?" The oath shall be administered by the Chairman or Committee member designated by him to administer oaths.

(e) At a disciplinary hearing the burden of proof rests on the staff with respect to each count to establish the facts alleged therein clearly and convincingly by the evidence that it introduces.

(f) Phase two of a disciplinary hearing shall consist of oral and/or written submission by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation which has been proved. Testimony by witnesses will not be heard at phase two except by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

Recommendations

Rule 17. (a)(1)(A) As soon as practicable after the completion of the first phase of a disciplinary hearing respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee shall consider each count contained in the Statement and with respect to each count as originally drawn or as amended shall vote on a motion that the count has been proved. A count shall not be proved unless at least a majority of the Committee vote for a motion that the count has been proved. A count which is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the Committee.

(B) If the Committee votes that a count has been proved, the Committee may upon completion of the second phase of the disciplinary hearing, by a majority vote of the Committee, consider and vote on a motion that a recommendation be made to the House for appropriate action respecting the violation charged in such count.

(2) If in a vote taken under paragraph (1)(A) respecting a count a majority of the Committee does not vote that the count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may only be made by a Member who voted that the count was not proved. If in a vote taken under paragraph (1)(B) to adopt a recommendation to the House respecting a violation charged in a count a majority of the Committee does not vote in favor of the

recommendation, a motion to reconsider that vote may only be made by a Member who voted against the recommendation.

(b)(1) With respect to any violation with which a Member of the House was charged in a count which the Committee has voted as proved, the Committee may include in its recommendation to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) Expulsion from the House.

(B) Censure.

(C) Reprimand.

(D) Fine.

(E) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House may impose such denial or limitation.

(F) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(2) With respect to any violation with which an officer or employee of the House was charged in a count which the Committee has voted as proved, the Committee may include in its recommendation to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) Dismissal from employment.

(B) Fine.

(C) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(c)(1) The purpose of this clause is to inform the Members of the House of Representatives as to the general guidelines the Committee considers appropriate for determining which, if any, sanctions to recommend to the House respecting violations proved in a disciplinary hearing. This clause does not limit the authority of the Committee to make or not to make recommendations for such sanctions.

(2) For technical violations, the Committee may direct that the violation be reported to the House without a recommendation for a sanction.

(3) With respect to the sanctions which the Committee may determine to include in a recommendation to the House respecting a violation, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an officer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity.

(d) The Committee report accompanying a recommendation to the House adopted by the Committee under clause (a)(1)(B) respecting a violation charged in a count shall contain a brief but complete statement of the evidence which supported the finding as to that count and a brief statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommendation.

Disclosure of Evidence

Rule 18. Upon the request of a respondent, the Committee may permit the respondent to inspect, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects which the Committee intends to use as evidence against the respondent in a disciplinary hearing and which are material to the preparation of the defense of the respondent.

Subpart C—Evidence and witnesses

Exculpatory Information

Rule 19. If the Committee at any time receives any exculpatory information respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct, it shall make such information available to such Member, officer, or employee.

Admissibility of Evidence

Rule 20. (a) Any evidence that is relevant and probative shall be admissible in any hearing of the Committee, unless the evidence is privileged or unless the Constitution otherwise requires its exclusion. Objections going only to the weight that should be given to evidence will not justify its exclusion.

(b) The Chairman or other Member presiding at a hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility at the hearing of testimony or evidence presented to the Committee. The Chairman or other Member presiding may limit the presentation of repetitious evidence. Rulings shall be final unless reversed or modified by a majority vote of the Committee members present.

Witnesses

Rule 21. (a) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of his scheduled appearance to allow him a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel should he so desire.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically authorized by the Chairman, no member of the Committee or staff shall make public the name of any witness subpoenaed by the Committee before the date of his scheduled appearance.

(c) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights and to raise objections to procedures or to the admissibility of testimony and evidence. Counsel for a witness other than the respondent shall not be permitted to engage in oral argument with the committee. After a witness has testified, his counsel may submit to the Committee, in writing, any questions he wishes propounded to his client and any request for additional witnesses or other evidence. Such request may be granted at the Committee's discretion.

(d) The respondent may apply to the Committee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the production of documents on his behalf. The application shall be granted upon a concise showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available. The application shall be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(e) Each witness subpoenaed by the Committee may sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees, which may be obtained from the Committee staff.

(f) Each witness appearing before the Committee shall be furnished a printed copy of the rules of the Committee and the pertinent provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.●

EULOGY ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, February is the month of Abraham Lincoln's birth, and, before the month slips away, I would like to submit for the RECORD a eulogy to President Lincoln that was delivered on the House floor on February 12, 1916, by the Honorable William August Rodenberg of Illinois.

Our former colleague from New York, the Honorable Sterling Cole, had memorized parts of this eulogy for practicing public speaking when he was in high school and recently found the text as originally published. Mr. Cole suggested that the eulogy be reprinted for those who may not have seen it. It is as eloquent an oration as the House has heard, and I commend it to my colleagues for study:

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, fivescore and seven years ago to-day the star of destiny shone resplendent over the cradle of an infant boy who, in the years to follow, was to be acclaimed by history as one of America's greatest contributions to the world's heritage of great and noble men. On that day, in a cabin home, amid the hills of Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln was born, and on this anniversary of his birth the memory of that great and Godlike life thrills the soul of every American, giving him an inspiration of true nobility. [Applause.]

Abraham Lincoln! What a flood of mighty memories is awakened by that name. What a glorious panorama of patriotic achievement it presents to view. How it seems to fathom the very depths of duty and devotion, the innermost springs of sympathy and of sorrow. As we pronounce it reverently today the trials and tragedies and triumphs of the Nation's supremest struggle pass again in review before us and, rising above the stress and strife of conflict, grand and majestic, like some tall cliff "that midway leaves the storm," we behold the one great central figure of that epoch of heroism, the one never-failing beacon light of national patriotism—our Lincoln—the world's Lincoln. [Applause.]

As I attempt to-day to pay tribute to a personality so great, a character so grand, so complex, and yet so simple, I am overwhelmed with a sense of my inability to do even partial justice to his name and fame. I shall content myself, therefore, with a brief reference to a few of his great traits of character which I believe have left a profound and lasting impression upon the American mind.

Why is it that no other name in the long roll of distinguished American statesmen stirs the heart of the Nation so deeply as that of Abraham Lincoln? Orators never weary of singing his praise, and hearers never tire of listening. Books on Lincoln multiply each year, and interest in them never flags. Every trivial relic of his homely life, every scrap of his writing, every prophetic saying, every jest, every anecdote, is treasured to-day by the people and bequeathed by them "as a rich legacy unto their issue."

It is not enough to say that Lincoln was a wise and patriotic President who died a martyr to a great cause. We have had other

wise and devoted Presidents, and he is not the only martyr, but there is only one Lincoln. Washington we reverence, Jackson we admire, Lincoln we love. His memory is enshrined more deeply in the heart of the Nation than that of any other man, and there is none so close as he to the source of tears and of emotion.

This can not be explained by the fact that Lincoln rose by manly effort from the humblest ranks of backwoods life to the highest position in the gift of any people. It can not be accounted for by the fact that he was a noble embodiment of that splendid spirit of self-reliance that is bred of generations of lonely struggle under the shadow of the forest primeval. It is not even because he signed the great proclamation of emancipation.

These things are a part of the reason for the esteem in which we hold Lincoln, and so are his inexhaustible humor, his intense earnestness, his tireless industry, his honesty and fairness, his courage, and his steadfastness of purpose. His homely and unaffected words and ways had something to do with his popularity, and so had his sturdy common sense. But not all of these sterling traits could make a Lincoln without something additional; nor is the secret revealed by naming what is usually regarded as the crowning trait of his magnificent character—the fact that he always sought the right as God gave him to see the right; and that he devoted his life to a steadfast pursuit of it when once he was convinced he had found it. This will explain much, but it will never explain the flood of tender emotion that wells up from American hearts at mention of his incomparable name.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the true secret of our love for Lincoln was his own love for his fellow man. [Applause.] In his ungainly, giant form there was a heart of infinite human sympathy, and this it was that illumined all his other traits of greatness and has made the imperishable halo that lingers around his head. [Applause.] Without these he might have achieved greatness, might have become President, might have freed the slaves as a political necessity, might even have brought the war to a successful close, and have fallen a victim to an assassin's bullet, and yet we should not to-day be speaking of him as we do. It is this one supreme trait of human sympathy that carries his name out of the realm of intellect into that of emotion. [Applause.]

It was this same deep human sympathy that caused Lincoln to hate slavery and to throw all of the power of his logic and eloquence against it. It was this, too, that enabled him to hold that marvelous balance of judgment which could put the Union above all else and could hold back emancipation until the right time. He could put himself in the place of the citizen of the border States and feel that any radical move would imperil the cause of freedom itself. This note of human sympathy sounded forth in his first inaugural; it ran throughout his relations with the soldiers during the great war, and animated his last acts as it had his first. The soldiers fighting on the field and dying in the hospital thought of him, and they said to each other: "He cares! He makes us fight, but he cares"; and they fought on as they never would have fought without that warmth of feeling for the head of the Nation.

Looking at the matter from any aspect and at any period of Lincoln's life, the prime cause of his greatness and of our present reverence for him is the fact that he

was human in the best and truest sense of that fine word, and this is reason enough why the Nation loves the name of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the fast-falling shadows of the past leave few names of men not enshrouded by their gloom. Many of the heroes of to-day will be lost to sight in the dimness of the approaching twilight. Tomorrow's sun will lighten up new shrines surrounded by tireless hosts of hero worshipers. As we look toward the past, earth's greatest heroes seem in strangest company—Christ and the condemned men, the missionary and the cannibal, Lincoln and the despised black man—there they stand together in the crowd, on Calvary, surrounded by jeering multitudes; but to-day they are together among the immortals. [Applause.] These saviors of the race will never be forgotten. Lincoln's heart solved more problems than his brain. His very gentleness made him the great emancipator, reconciler, the composite character of the American people. Hope which is the prophet in every heart, was king and priest besides in his. It ruled his life and consecrated his deeds. Other men turned their backs in despair on the Republic's future; he, through densest darkness, saw with prescient light and gaze the glory of the coming dawn. [Applause.]

In the city of Springfield, in beautiful Oak Ridge Cemetery, he sleeps the sleep of eternity. Many are the times that I have stood with bowed head beside that sacred tomb and thought of the great soul that once inhabited the tenement of clay now moldering into the dust from whence it came. And standing there in the presence of the mighty dead, my faith in humanity has been strengthened and my confidence in the perpetuity of the Republic and its glorious destiny has been made secure. [Applause.]

History tells us that when Robert Bruce, King of Scotland, was dying he asked that his heart be removed from his body and borne by knightly hands to the sacred sepulcher of the Savior. Upon his death the Earl of Douglas, his trusted friend and companion, removed the heart from the body, placed it in a beautiful golden casket, and, surrounding himself with a number of brave young Scotch warriors, they set out on their holy mission. On the way they were attacked by a large body of Moors, who almost overcame them by force of superior numbers. When defeat seemed almost certain, Douglas took in his hand the sacred casket and hurled it far out into the midst of the enemy, shouting:

Lead on, heart of Bruce,
We follow thee!

And the knights of Scotland, never having been defeated when following the leadership of Bruce, took new courage. They rushed upon the enemy with the fury of the whirlwind and gained the day. [Applause.]

To-day when those who, unmindful of the spirit that animated the founders of this Republic, would fan the flames of racial fury and kindle into life the dying embers of bigotry and intolerance; when those who, for base and ignoble purposes of self-exploitation, would place the brand of treason upon the brows of men whose loyalty and devotion in the darkest days of the Nation's life were never questioned—to-day, when the enemies of that broader and better fraternalism, which lies at the very foundation of national peace and national unity, are advancing upon us, the true and loyal citizens of this Republic, of whatever creed or ancestry, catching the inspiration that breathes

upon them from the glorious memories of the past, with true American patriotism will take in their hand the great heart of Abraham Lincoln, incase it in their love, and hurl it far out into the midst of the enemy, shouting:

Lead on, heart of Lincoln,
We follow thee;
We follow thee!

[Prolonged applause.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today, immediately following the remarks of Mr. MURTHA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COMBEST) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ECKERT of New York, for 60 minutes, April 17.

Mr. ARMEY, for 60 minutes, March 6.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHUETTE, for 5 minutes, April 27.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRENZEL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENNY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ADDABBO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WIRTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. JACOBS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LaFALCE, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, February 27.

Mr. JACOBS, for 60 minutes, February 27.

Mr. STOKES, for 60 minutes, February 28.

Mr. McCURDY, for 60 minutes, February 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. OWENS, on the special order of Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana, today.

Mr. PENNY, just prior to the vote on H.R. 1096, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COMBEST) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COURTER in two instances.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. MONSON.

Mr. IRELAND.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

Mr. McCANDLESS.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENNY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WISE.

Mr. APPELGATE.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. FROST in two instances.

Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.

Mr. YATRON in two instances.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mrs. COLLINS.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. RODINO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 27, 1985, at 1 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows.

609. A letter from the Executive Associate Director for Budget and Legislation, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriation for the Department of Transportation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

610. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of the activities of the Commission, pursuant to the act of June 6, 1934, chapter 404, section 23(b) (89 Stat. 155); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

611. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting the President's determination that it is important to U.S. security interests to use FAA funds under the special authority of section 614 of the act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2364(a)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

612. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on U.S. strategy to protect and conserve biological diversity in developing countries, pursuant to FAA, section 119(d) (97 Stat. 1045); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

613. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a notice of intent to offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Japan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

614. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the evaluation of compliance with the requirements of the internal accounting and administrative control system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

615. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

616. A letter from the Director, ACTION, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

617. A letter from the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

618. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the use and distribution of funds of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall Reservation in Docket 326-C-2 before the U.S. Claims Court, pursuant to Public Law 93-134, sections 2(a) and 4; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

619. A letter from the Director, Accounting and Financial Management Division, General Accounting Office, transmitting the certification of the Defense Department's estimate of revenue to be deposited in the Panama Canal Commission fund, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3712(c)(2); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

620. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting notification that there were no professional and scientific positions established under 5 U.S.C. 3104 and 5 U.S.C. 5371 during calendar year 1984, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3104(b); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

621. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 15 of the United States Code to provide mandatory reporting authority for the collection of data on the apparel industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

622. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the results of investigations of allegations of possible fraud, gross waste of funds, and mismanagement in the administration of a Department of the Air Force contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1206(b)(5)(A) (92 Stat. 1125); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

623. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a waiver of minimum funding and staffing requirements for technology transfer from Federal laboratories, pursuant to Public Law 96-480, section 11(b); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

624. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report on four new advanced scientific computing centers; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

625. A letter from the Under Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on funds expended for trade adjustment assistance training, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 236(a)(2) (95 Stat. 885); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

626. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to assure adequate funding for the cleanup of abandoned hazardous waste sites, and for other purposes, (H. Doc. No. 99-32); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Public Works and Transportation, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Judiciary and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. Supplemental report on H.R. 1035 (Rept. No. 99-6, Pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 79. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1035, a bill to provide emergency credit and debt adjustment relief to financially stressed farmers and ranchers (Rept. No. 99-7). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of February 25, 1985]

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1035. A bill to provide emergency credit and debt adjustment relief to financially stressed farmers and ranchers, with amendments; referred to the Committee on Appropriations for a period not to exceed 15 legislative days with instructions to report back to the House as provided in section 401(b) of Public Law 93-344 (Rept. No. 99-6, Pt. I). Ordered to be printed.

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. ANDERSON:

H.R. 1262. A bill to equalize the duties on imported tuna, whether or not packed in oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 1263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase to \$4,000 the maximum deduction for contributions to retirement savings and to allow the deduction for such savings to be computed for married individuals on the basis of their combined compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONIOR of Michigan:

H.R. 1264. A bill to deauthorize the O'Neill Unit of the Missouri River basin project in Nebraska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.R. 1265. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on dicyclohexylbenzothiazolesul-

fenamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COURTER:

H.R. 1266. A bill expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain actions which should be taken in anticipation of the centennial anniversary of the Statue of Liberty National Monument, and directing the Secretary of the Interior to retain the American Museum of Immigration at the base of the Statue of Liberty National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DERRICK (for himself, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MACK, Mr. MICA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. HENDON, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1267. A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Compact; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DREIER of California:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for the purchase and installation of locks and other security devices on residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1269. A bill to repeal certain recently enacted substantiation and compliance provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 1270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a monument in Washington, to honor Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 1271. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide for the continued classification of certain cities as metropolitan cities for purposes of assistance under the community development block grant program; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 1272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the residential energy credit with respect to solar renewable energy source expenditures, with declining percentages of credit, through 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARCIA (for himself, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr.

HOWARD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1273. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on the failure by a charitable organization to use certain funds to provide legal services to the poor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 1274. A bill to apportion certain funds for construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and for construction of substitute highway and transit projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KINDNESS:

H.R. 1275. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to construct a flood control project for the Miami River at Fairfield, OH; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 1276. A bill to provide for an orderly transition to interstate banking; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEATH of Texas:

H.R. 1277. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize procedures among the Armed Forces for the appointment of warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 1278. A bill to extend the Federal Supplemental Compensation Act of 1985 and to improve the method for determining the number of weeks for which Federal supplemental compensation is payable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SKORSKI):

H.R. 1279. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to improve quality control standards and procedures under the AFDC program, and to provide for studies to assist in the further improvement of such standards and procedures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1280. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to develop a program to expand the use of underutilized banks by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1281. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 1282. A bill to extend veterans benefits to persons serving in the Armed Forces between November 12, 1918, and July 2, 1921; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia (for himself, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. RAY, Mr. DARDEN,

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TAUKE):

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend the Highway Improvement Act of 1982 to provide additional funds for the completion of certain priority primary projects; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 1284. A bill to establish a Bipartisan Commission on Congressional Campaign Financing, to improve the manner in which congressional campaigns are financed; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VALENTINE:

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat certain uses of public law enforcement and other vehicles as nontaxable fringe benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 1286. A bill to increase to \$500,000 the maximum annual receipts certain agricultural businesses may have and still be treated as small businesses for certain purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WIRTH (for himself, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WAGREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, and Mr. WEAVER):

H.R. 1287. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority of the Secretary of Energy to conduct epidemiological studies of the effects of radiation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 168. Joint resolution designating May 5, 1985, as "Armed Forces Chaplains' Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan):

H.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1985 as "Better Hearing and Speech Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 5, 1985, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a uniform State act should be developed and adopted which provides grandparents with adequate rights to petition State courts for privileges to visit their grandchildren following the dissolution (because of divorce, separation, or death) of the marriage of such grandchildren's parents, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Amtrak service is essential to U.S. transportation and should continue to receive Federal assistance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MICA, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. JOHNSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HENDON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. BONER of Tennessee):

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that payments by the Veterans' Administration to veterans as compensation for service-connected disabilities should remain exempt from Federal income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROTH:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution calling for international agreement on tariff and tax preferences to encourage exports by small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. Res. 78. Resolution concerning permission to take official pictures of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 80. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Energy and Commerce in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 1st session of the 99th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MRAZEK (for himself, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. PURSELL):

H. Res. 82. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

17. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the Southeast Interstate Low-level Radioactive Waste Management Compact; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H.R. 1288. A bill for the relief of Bassam S. Belmany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Divinia Manatad and Jeuerita Manatad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Ray A. Bonney; 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. 37: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 47: Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 56: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. HARTNETT, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 85: Mr. GREGG.

H.R. 100: Mr. McCURDY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. McEWEN, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 156: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. UDALL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 229: Mr. VENTO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BEILSONSON, Mr. BATES, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 250: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

H.R. 290: Mr. STOKES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 436: Mr. HARTNETT and Mr. CHAPPIE.

H.R. 445: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 509: Mr. ROBINSON and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 528: Mr. RODINO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FISH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. KRAMER, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 555: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 642: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 693: Mr. CHAPPIE and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 700: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATES, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 704: Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 709: Mr. SHELBY.

H.R. 748: Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. GROTEBERG, Mr. HYDE, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. MILLER of Wash-

ington, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WISE, Mr. STRANG, Mr. DI-GUARDI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 880: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 890: Mr. ADDABBO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. McDADE, and Mr. NOWAK.

H.R. 925: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WISE, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 926: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 945: Mr. MOORE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. COATS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 968: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. STARK, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1072: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 1082: Mr. IRELAND.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LELAND, Mr. ROE, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1090: Mr. HAYES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SABO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WISE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1097: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1132: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1142: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1161: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BATES, Mr. COELHO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FAUNTROY, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1207: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MACKAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. HOWARD, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr.

IRELAND, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOODY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. DeWINE, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.J. Res. 50: Mr. FUQUA, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ECKERT of New York, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.J. Res. 126: Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 142: Mr. BROOKS, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WEAVER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SABO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. REID, Mr. WILSON, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. NEAL.

H. Con. Res. 7: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. BRYANT.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. CHANDLER.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. COELHO, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LENT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MACK, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROGERS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. LENT, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. De LUGO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FISH, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WEAVER.

H. Res. 20: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H. Res. 22: Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. WILSON.

H. Res. 25: Mr. STALLINGS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

41. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Fairview Park, OH, relative to honoring Cui Ziyxi (Charlie Two Shoes) with resident alien status; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1035

By Mr. BEREUTER:

—(1) Amend section 349(a)(5) as found in section 2 of H.R. 1035 by:

(1) deleting the phrase "establishing the" and replacing it with the phrase "making a loan available to an existing borrower of the lender or a borrower from a failed, closed or liquidated financial institution at an";

(2) delete the phrase "for the loan at a level . . .";

(3) delete the phrase ". . . that will ensure that" and replacing it with the phrase "If (a)"; and

(4) after the last word in subsection (5) insert the following: "(b) if the lenders agree to enter into agreements with borrowers to provide sufficient credit under this

program for 5 years to borrowers who continue to operate farms and ranches."

—(2) Amend section 349 as found in section 2 of H.R. 1035 by the following additional paragraphs:

"(7) shall review all loans guaranteed under this program on an annual basis;

"(8) may discontinue a loan guarantee with respect to any borrower who, the Secretary finds after consultation with the appropriate lender, would qualify for credit without such loan guarantee;

"(9) shall on a priority basis—
 "(a) provide direct loans to borrowers (i) who meet the positive cash-flow requirements of this program, (ii) who are unable to obtain operating loans from approved lenders, and (iii) who had operating loans with lenders who have failed, closed, or been liquidated; or

"(b) guarantee loans to be obtained by such borrowers from sources of capital provided by States, political subdivisions thereof, or other persons for the purpose of as-

sisting borrowers of failed, closed, or liquidated lenders."

—(3) Amend section 4(a)(2) by deleting the phrase "a new paragraph (2)" and replacing it with the phrase "new paragraphs (2) and (3)" and inserting the following new paragraph and renumbering the existing subparagraph (2) as subparagraph (3):

"(2) In implementing the approved lender program established under section 339 of this Act on May 4, 1984, the Secretary shall ensure that each request of a lending institution for designation as an approved lender under the program be reviewed, and a decision made on the application, within fifteen days after the lending institution has submitted a completed application to the Farmers Home Administration. Any such request of a lending institution that maintains loan portfolios of which not less than 25 percent of all outstanding loans are agricultural loans or loans to agriculturally-related businesses shall be automatically approved."