HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 18, 1985*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Grant us, O gracious God, during this time of remembrance of the days of the Holocaust, an understanding of the suffering of those victims and families who experienced such terror. May the events of that darkness encourage us to give light to our world; may the despair of those tragedies cause us to find hope in our world; may the evil that was practiced be overcome by deeds of justice in our world. Forgive us, O God, that we do not appreciate that all people are created by You, and we should live as one people in peace, demonstrating Your creation and glory. May we realize that the suffering of some is the suffering of all, and by sharing and understanding together we better reflect the bond that exists between us. Help us, O God, in all the paths of life, to do justice, love mercy, and ever walk humbly with You. 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution commemorating the twenty-fourth anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion to liberate Cuba from Communist tyranny.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 597. An act to amend subtitle II of title 46, United States Code, "Shipping", making technical and conforming changes, and for other purposes;

S. 817. An act to authorize appropriations under the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; and

S. 818. An act to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

INSENSITIVITY AND CONDESCENSION TOWARD HANDICAPPED NOT ACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for my entire 16 years in the House, I have served with pride, on the Education and Labor Committee. It has produced hundreds of important laws in that time. I was especially proud to be an original cosponsor of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1974.

These two laws established the philosophy that Congress saw its role as advocates for the disabled, and its recognition that the disabled had a right to be fully participating members of society.

The remarks attributed to Dr. Eileen M. Gardner, a newly appointed official in the Department of Education, reflect another philosophy of Government toward the disabled—one of insensitivity and condescension. These two philosophies are not compatible. Dr. Gardner's is contemptible and offensive to me and to many in this institution.

I intend to look very closely at the Department of Education's budget for fiscal year 1986. In my mind, I see no justification to spend 1 cent of appropriated funds to set up a new Office of Education Philosophy and Practice if it is staffed by people whose philosophies could influence practice and produce policy that is inimical to the disabled of our Nation.

LET US CELEBRATE THE LIBERATION OF EUROPEANS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I got up this beautiful spring morning, turned on my TV, and watched a "PR presidency" go mad.

First of all, we heard that the young 8-year-old girl that we were told was a Nicaraguan refugee was really an American citizen. Mr. President, that was a tad deceptive.

But then across the TV screen came a very official Government car, and we were told that it was the White House advance team on concentration camps. What are they looking for? The right light angle? Are they looking for concentration camps that had carpet?

Really, how sick is this. Let us remember what this celebration in June of the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe is to celebrate. It is to celebrate the end of a government that went mad in Europe. It is the 40th anniversary of finally liberating all Europeans, including Germans from this incredibly mad government. I stand here with a German last name, Mr. President, and I say to you: Do not go to the cemetery where people are buried who tried to perpetrate these things. Don't look for the nicest concentration camp you can find. You can't sugarcoat the Holocaust. Instead, let us honor our American heritage and celebrate the liberation of Europeans. Germans will not be angry. They were liberated also.

SECRETARY WEINBERGER'S NEW MONOPOLY GAME

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

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, some 95 million Americans filed our taxes by last Monday, and as we signed those forms we swore that we told the truth. We do it when we get a drivers license, a fishing license, even a dog license. If we lie, we're in trouble and we might go to jail.

But when defense contractors like General Dynamics bill the taxpayers for tens of billions of dollars, they don't have to swear they honestly earned it.

After the Energy and Commerce Committee began our investigation of defense contracting, Defense Secretary Weinberger announced a new "get tough" policy. He said he would make contractors swear not to lie when they bill the taxpayers. That was on nationwide TV. But the defense contractors complained and Weinberger quietly reversed himself. Now he says to his pals: "I was only kidding, you don't have to swear to the truth."

It's the Secretary's newest version of monopoly: Do not go to jail. Pass go and collect billions from the taxpayers.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will remind the visitors in the galleries that under the rules of the House they

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

must refrain from demonstrations of any type.

THREAT OF NICARAGUAN AIRFIELDS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, several years ago when the President went before the American people and showed photographs of the 10,000-foot airfield that was being constructed in Grenada, the Marxist government immediately retorted that that airfield would, in fact, be used to ship only spice and would not be used by the Soviets or the Cuban military.

After we captured the documents in Grenada, the 26,000 pounds of documents, we found a record of a secret Central Committee meeting in which Liam James stated it was decided in the meeting that the airfield would be used by the Soviet and Cuban military.

Let us not be so naive as to believe that the airfields being constructed in Nicaragua will not be used by the Soviet and Cuban military.

□ 1110

BUDGET RESTRAINT URGED ON FORMER PRESIDENTS' ALLOWANCES

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

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, former President Nixon has taken the lead. Now will Mr. Ford and Mr. Carter follow? I doubt it.

Mr. Nixon has decided to forego his taxpayer-paid security, saving the U.S. Treasury over $3 million annually. Budget restraint has not been seen in this area of former Presidents' allowances. The President's fiscal year 1986 budget calls for a 3.2-percent increase in spending on former Presidents, on top of a 12-percent increase since fiscal year 1984.

For this reason, I am reintroducing legislation which I sponsored during the last session to place realistic limits on the amount which taxpayers must spend for the benefits that former Chief Executives receive. While my bill will make certain that former Chief Executives have the protection and the benefits they earned, it will limit the excessive growth of this spending and assure that a new royalty for former Presidents has not been established at taxpayers' expense.

Last year when I introduced this legislation, a resident of my district urged support for my bill as she put it: To "limit how much we might pay to keep our former Presidents living the good life." She went on: "Why should we pay to support these men in such a fashion? Expenses within reason are fair, but extravagant luxury is not."

Her opinion is even more valid today, and I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort to place realistic limits on the benefits that our former Chiefs of State receive.

LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PENALTIES FOR 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, I am today introducing legislation which would go a long way toward closing the loopholes which now exist in the Federal law under kidnaping.

Kidnaping under any definition is an act of terrorism, and we must do all we can to deter that type of criminal activity. The important feature of this bill is to recognize that too often our children are the targets of would-be kidnapers, so to help deter that kind of activity we are asking through this bill that we increase the penalties for attempting kidnaping of children under 13.

Mr. Speaker, this should act as a signal to would-be kidnapers that this society will not tolerate that type of despicable behavior.

FORTY "GHOST VOTERS" IDENTIFIED IN INDIANA CONGRESSIONAL RACE

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the race in the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana is coming down to the wire. Last night my Republican colleagues again took the floor in special orders to rail about the recount, but what we did not hear was any attention of the 40 "ghost voters" who have been found in two counties carried by the Republican candidate. You see, there were 40 more votes on the voting machines in those counties than the total number of voters who walked into the polls.

If those 40 "ghost votes" are removed from the totals, the Democrat, Frank McCloskey, will be the winner. If they are counted, the Republican candidate may win.

I am calling on the task force that is investigating the Eighth Congressional District not to demean the real voters in that district by letting ghost voters influence the outcome.

Mr. Speaker, the next time our Republican colleagues take the floor on the election contest in the Eighth District I hope they will open their remarks by agreeing that the Eighth Congressional District contest should be decided by real voting citizens, not by 40 ghost voters.

MEMBERS URGED TO REMAIN STEADFAST IN REFUSING AID TO CONTRAS

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there are times in this House when I have a great pride in this U.S. House of Representatives and I am grateful for the opportunity to serve therein. We are now in the midst of one of those times. I am referring to the steadfastness that the House is evidencing in refusing to accept the ill-conceived notion by the administration that we ought to put $14 million into the Contras in Nicaragua.

Fourteen million dollars is not the issue, although it should be when our people are being forced back into poverty. We should not be spending $14 million for military aid. But there is a larger issue, and it gnaws at me, it gnaws at you, and it gnaws at the American public. We do not want another entanglement that is going to quagmire us in Central America. We do not want another Vietnam.

I do not want to see another black wall with the names of more than 50,000 young Americans killed in a senseless war. I do not want to see another 300,000 Americans wounded in a war we should not be involved in. I respect the veterans but not the war. I do not want to see more numbers of our people mentally and spiritually ill because of their involvement in a war in Nicaragua.

I say to the Members of this House that this is the time that we refuse this $14 million. The threat of another Vietnam, the threat of being quagmired again in a senseless war is absolutely abhorrent to the American people, and I urge that we defeat any such ill-conceived notion that $14 million from this country should go to the Contras.

Mr. Speaker, this week the Reagan administration will attempt to expand its agenda of military and paramilitary activities against the Government of Nicaragua when President Reagan seeks $14 million in funds from Congress for the Contras—rebels whom he refers to as freedom fighters. I believe the means by which the administration is attempting to resolve matters, by overthrowing the government not to its liking, is counterproductive to American interest and the interest of our allies abroad.

In February 1985, President Reagan brazenly admitted to wanting to remove the Sandinista government, or making it cry uncle. This means that once again, the administration's actions are being performed without regard to the historical examples of the tragic consequences in that region. Now, the Congress must decide wheth-

er to approve $14 million for these mercenaries in the service of the Reagan administration.

The World Court has determined that the United States has already committed aggressive acts against Nicaragua, such as mining its harbors and aiding and abetting the Contras, and therefore is in violation of international law. In other words, the administration proposal to continue Federal funds for the Contras against the Sandinista government in Nicaragua is strictly punitive, and devoid of reason. These Contras have demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt their violent, bloodthirsty nature.

If the administration continues to violate the sovereignty of Nicaragua by openly invading with armed might, and by openly supporting the Contras with arms, then this country will be headed for a serious crisis. Continued support for the Contras will only serve to draw us steadily into an expanding military role in Central America without any clear long-term objective. We need a more sensitive policy designed to negotiate long-term solutions.

It is my firm belief that the United States should support measures at the Organization of American States, as well as efforts of the Contadora group which seek to end support for terrorists, subversive, or other activities aimed at the violent overthrow of the governments of the countries in Central America. Working through the Organization of American States and the Contadora process is the proper and most effective means of dealing with threats to peace in Central America.

I shall continue to vote against any Federal funds for the Contra forces in Central America.

WHO WILL INVEST IN OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE?

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the children of today—the kids in the playgrounds, in the elementary schools—will enter the labor force around the year 2000. The jobs they will find, and the pay those jobs can offer, will hinge on the capital investments made over the next 15 years.

Those 15 years will see the U.S. Treasury becoming an ever more active competitor for the lender's dollar. The Treasury has already saturated the long-term bond market—its issuance of long bonds has increased by 2½ times in just 5 years—and our heaviest borrowing years lie ahead.

As we plunge ahead through the debt-laden 1980's, private borrowing will become more risky, more expensive, and less predictable.

But what is predictable is that new job-creating and productivity-enhancing investments—investments that would benefit our children—will not be made at the rate they should be, and would be if we weren't running huge budget deficits year after year.

THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION—A WISE INVESTMENT

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, this spring the Appalachian Regional Commission celebrates 20 years of service to the lesser developed areas of 13 Eastern States.

Through the provision of public facilities in the form of roads, sewer and water systems, clinics, libraries, and vocational schools, the ARC has made the Appalachian region more attractive to industries seeking new plant locations.

Economic development in my southwest Virginia district has been substantial and can be attributed directly to ARC assistance. Other Appalachian States have enjoyed a similar experience. Clearly, this Federal effort in partnership with local governments is succeeding.

But the work must go on. Many of our localities do not have sufficient public facilities to accommodate further growth, and they can acquire those facilities only with the help of ARC.

The President is asking that the Appalachian Regional Commission be abolished. I strongly disagree with this proposal. ARC produces substantial returns. It is a wise investment in our economic future.

UNFORTUNATE COMMENTS REGARDING HANDICAPPED BY EILEEN GARDNER

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, seldom if ever do I mention the fact that as a teenager I had polio and seldom do I ever refer to it, but I refer to it today because it has come to my attention that the President, through his Secretary of Education, Mr. Bennett, has appointed an Eileen Gardner to head the handicapped programs in the Department of Education.

Eileen Gardner has issued some very unfortunate comments regarding the handicapped and has set a very improper tone, among them referring to the handicapped as being "ineffective malcontents."

I think that is crass, Mr. Speaker. I speak not only for myself, but I would also like to tell you about the fact that several of us are graduates and former patients of a place called Warm Springs, GA. The Congressman from New York, JIM SCHEUER, and I were patients there together.

Bo Ginn, former Congressman from Georgia, followed me at Warm Springs, GA.

Senator EAST followed me by several years.

I also think on behalf of the 25,000 American disabled veterans, the 33 million handicapped across our Nation, that we take offense at her comments and we certainly ask that the President withdraw her appointment, because she certainly is not deserving of such a high office.

REMEMBERING THOMAS JEFFERSON

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

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, during the last week we celebrated a lot of things in Washington, DC. One of the things we celebrated was the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, on April 13. As we know, Mr. Jefferson was the author of the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence spoke about "inalienable rights."

Mr. Speaker, that means those rights are given by God. They cannot be taken away, that they are universal and all people have the right to them.

The democratic Contras in Central America that are fighting now are fighting for those rights. People in Central America that are desirous of establishing true democracy are really Jeffersonians and let us not forget that.

Remember, this is not a fight between Contras and another group of people. This is a fight for liberty, the principles that the Declaration of Independence and Thomas Jefferson stood for. When we celebrate the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, let us really celebrate it by giving liberty an opportunity next week.

TIME TO ABANDON FAILED POLICIES OF THE PAST IN CENTRAL AMERICA

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, the President argues that a dollar for the Contras is a dollar for peace. This twisted logic will lead to nothing but further bloodshed and further alienation of all Nicaraguan people.

President Reagan has also said that Calvin Coolidge is his favorite President, and I believe him. Under President Coolidge, nearly 6,000 marines oc-

cupied Nicaragua to protect so-called "American interests." What have 80 years of American protection produced for Nicaragua?

Mr. Speaker, it is time to abandon the failed policies of the past. Negotiation, not confrontation, is the answer.

The Contadora process, by bringing together all concerned nations in a spirit of cooperation, is the best chance we have to start bringing stability and peace to Central America. It is the region's future which is at stake here, and it is the region which must develop a solution.

I am encouraged to hear that the Contadora talks are resuming in Panama City, and that Canada has offered to monitor compliance with any agreement. Isn't it time the United States threw its full weight behind this bargaining process?

No one says the process will be easy. Central America is beset by economic as well as political problems which are centuries old. The Contadora initiative offers the most positive step toward a lasting peace in the region.

Mr. Speaker, the President has not learned from the Coolidge policies of the past. The Contras represent not the future of Nicaragua, but a sad and brutal past. Let's face the future with courage, and vote no on more military hardware for the Contras.

THE BALTIMORE CONNECTION AND THE U.S. AIR FORCE CORPS

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Connection, an innovative civic group in my district, is trying to make it happen for kids. In an effort to promote and encourage the talent and ability of the young aspiring musical artists throughout Maryland, the Baltimore Connection is attempting to create a corps comprised of young adults throughout the State. Drum and bugle corps activities presently comprise both the largest youth oriented and spectator appealing activities in the United States and Canada.

Tomorrow and Saturday, the U.S. Air Force Academy Drum and Bugle Corps and Stage Band is going to perform in my district. One of the three Academy performances is going to be sponsored by the Baltimore Connection. The visit of the Air Force Drum and Bugle Corps will allow the youngsters the opportunity to observe and perform with accomplished and experienced musicians.

The goal of the Baltimore Connection Drum and Bugle Corps is to portray a musical image of Baltimore and Maryland throughout the State, while at the same time developing the talents of our youth. The development of their skills is not only important to the State of Maryland but to the entire country.

THE PROGRAMMABLE IMPLANTABLE MEDICATION SYSTEM (PIMS)

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a million Americans suffer from diabetes, a disease that destroys the body's ability to control its blood sugar and produces such serious complications as heart disease, kidney malfunction, and blindness, and thus causing its victims to lead very restrictive lifestyles.

A new technology has emerged that may ultimately free diabetics and victims of other long-term diseases from their restrictive lifestyles. NASA is working with private corporations and health care organizations in developing programmable, implantable medication systems [PIMS] that will automatically deliver prescribed doses of medication to key areas in the human body.

In 1979, NASA determined that existing technologies from several NASA research centers could contribute to the development of a PIMS. NASA along with Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University proved that the PIMS could work and encouraged further development of the system.

Today, the PIMS is a reality. It is performing well in long-term animal implants and will soon be tested in humans. Prospects for the PIMS are excellent, and researchers are investigating the possibility of applying it to a variety of other disease treatment programs.

The PIMS stands as an excellent example of how NASA technology, effectively applied, can help private industry solve important technical problems.

□ 1130

CENTRAL AMERICA: DOSE OF REALITY—NO. 3

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the War Powers Act, the President must submit to Congress a written report within 48 hours of taking any one of three specified acts.

I discussed the first specified act yesterday, which refers to the introduction of U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities or situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated. Today, I'll talk about the second specified act.

If the President sends U.S. Armed Forces into the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation while equipped for combat, he must report to Congress.

Has our President sent U.S. forces into the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation? Of course he has, We have CIA personnel in the territory of Nicaragua; we have 20,000 U.S. troops in the territory of Honduras; we have military in the territory of El Salvador; we participate in regular reconnaissance flights throughout the airspace of Central America; we have mined the waters of Nicaragua; and we have ships lodged in the waters of Honduras. These are all foreign nations, and the President is occupying their territory, their airspace, and their waters without reporting to Congress. This is a clear violation of the law.

And are the Americans who are occupying the territory, airspace, and waters of Central America "equipped for combat?" Of course they are. Our troops participating in exercises in Honduras are using live ammunition and tanks and weapons, so they are well-equipped for combat. The mines the CIA planted in the waters of Nicaragua were real mines. Our military personnel are carrying rifles, not just pistols. All these weapons are used in combat, not just for personal protection. The President has not only provided these weapons to the people of Central America, but he is using them himself in an illegal undeclared war.

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S NICARAGUAN POLICY

(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, the deliberate effort by President Reagan and members of his administration to deceive the American people regarding his Nicaraguan policy almost defies belief. Let me cite some examples.

Mr. Reagan tells the world that President Betancur of Colombia supports his proposal to provide $14 million to the counterrevolutionaries. Mr. Betancur then denies that he ever expressed such support and in fact he says he opposes that funding. Ditto with eight other Latin American heads of state whose letters expressing support for negotiations is transformed by the administration into support for funding, only to have Langhorne Motley, Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, acknowledge yesterday at a Foreign Affairs Committee hearing that none of those leaders ever expressed such support publicly. And finally, yesterday the President announces that the Pope supports his proposals, only to evoke

an immediate denial from the papal representative in Washington.

Why all the deception? Why is the administration so afraid of the truth?

Because the Reagan policy for Nicaragua is dangerously bankrupt and the American people have rejected it. Now it is the turn of Congress to do so unequivocally.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO THE HONORABLE JAMIE L. WHITTEN

(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, today is the birthday of one of our most esteemed colleagues, JAMIE WHITTEN, the dean of the House and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The State of Mississippi, the Congress of the United States, and the Nation as a whole owe JAMIE a special vote of thanks for his 54 years in politics. He began his political career when he was 21 as a member of the Mississippi House and continued his service as district attorney until he was elected to the 77th Congress. As the senior ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, I work closely with JAMIE on a daily basis. I can tell you that he is amiable, fair, and diligent in all of his efforts to bring the many bills to the floor that fund our entire Government's activities.

He has the institutional memory to tell us the why and the wherefore of programs developed in the days of President Franklin Roosevelt and up through the Republican and Democrat administrations alike to the present. He is also an institution in this body because he knows how to legislate and how to get others together to do so. JAMIE is young at heart and vigorous. Although he will not give Jack Nicklaus or Arnold Palmer scratch competition on the links, they can only spot him a few strokes before they get in trouble. So to my chairman and our dean, I want to take this opportunity to express for all of us here a continued good fortune for many more years to come. Happy birthday, JAMIE.

FARMWORKERS FIELD SANITATION STANDARDS

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, some distinguished voices have recently said the Labor Department's refusal to issue a farmworker field sanitation standard was nothing short of outrageous. No—in truth what is outrageous is this matter being a subject of disputation at all.

We are a nation priding itself on our inbred compassion and sense of dignity. Hygiene, I would have thought, is something which should not be bantered back and forth like any other socioeconomic question debated in a public tavern. We're not talking about interest rates on T bills; we're talking about the kind of health problems that should not exist in a technologically advanced civilization. Dysentery, cholera, hepatitis, and the like are infections we associate with standards of living from our distant past.

It would be only the most inhumane farm owner who would deliberately put his field workers at risk of contracting those avoidable infections. But what is the extent of such inhumanity?

Are we truly a nation of Simon Legrees forcing tens of thousands of fruit and vegetable fieldworkers to routinely endure sickness, dehydration, and digestive disorders for the sake of a bucket of tomatoes? No—I do not think this is the case. But I am certain there still exists a sizable number of farmworkers who lack the sanitary means to ensure good health. It is those people we must address ourselves.

The Labor Department tells us in its April 16, 1985, final determination by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration that over 75 percent of all fieldworkers now labor in States where there are statutory and regulatory provisions on field sanitation. Is this a statistic which can be refuted? Would a Federal standard improve the conditions under which this 75 percent population toil?

A Federal standard would extend an umbrella over the remaining 25 percent population who currently work in States where there is no sanitation standard. In those few States, are farmowners complying voluntarily to any degree? Can we assume with any justification that they are not?

And what are we to make of OSHA's declaration that of the 13 States which presently enforce field sanitation standards, 10 of them have stricter rules than those which our own Congress instructed OSHA to promulgate? The other three States have standards that somewhat parallel the Federal OSHA proposal. Is OSHA deceiving us with numbers we cannot instantly verify?

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that a Federal standard would principally satisfy a problem that exists in farm labor States with no statutory requirements. The States which now have enforceable standards are California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Maine, for blueberry pickers only. The extent to which any of these 13 States have fully implemented their sanitation standards is not precisely known to me—but all these States have regulations on their books. But other States where perishable commodities are prevalent need some protection. How are we to provide it if OSHA refuses to act?

That is a question we cannot immediately answer. Farm labor groups will play a key role in convincing certain State legislatures to get on with the task of doing what their neighboring States have done. It must be done. I find it personally inconceivable that the States lacking any sanitation guidelines have made no progress toward that end.

It seems to me the question here is not one of commitment to health. Absolutely everyone would agree to that. Even the groups representing agricultural employers did not argue to OSHA that farmworker health was not a desirable thing. Their principal argument was economics—and that is a pretty standard argument. It's a weak one, too. Fresh water and a portable toilet don't cost much to provide. I reject these arguments about cost-benefit ratios. They are inhumane in themselves. We are speaking of a question of basic morality and human decency.

What we need to address at this sad juncture in our efforts is the need for a Federal presence. OSHA claims it does not have the enforcement personnel to service a Federal standard. I won't argue with that—OSHA has been RIF'd like every other agency. Our several State departments of health and/or agriculture currently manage and oversee many Federal programs as well as indigenous State programs. Can those State agencies pick up the enforcement responsibility if a Federal standard were issued? It is a possibility. The OSHA belief that no Federal standard is needed because it can't be enforced is ludicrous.

Now what do we do. If a Federal standard whose rough silhouette was drawn by Congress is issued, it would preempt better standards in 13 States. It would seem to me that we have a choice. Congress can begin the process all over again, issue new legislative instructions that match or exceed the existing rules in those 13 States, and let OSHA proceed with a new round of rulemaking.

Our other choice is to support the efforts of existing groups to lobby in State capitols where there are no standards and apply some firm persuasion to get those States to do what is proper. It seems to me that instead of arguing over whether the Federal executive should take the lead or the States should take the lead—we should all be working toward our goal down the quickest avenue possible.

Mr. Speaker, how long can we sit back and allow these indignities to be suffered by human beings?

THE VOTE FOR AID TO THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS IN NICARAGUA

(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, many of my colleagues have said that the polls show that President Reagan's Central American policy is unpopular. Now that is turning around.

But even if it were not, remember the people of this country trust and respect Ronald Reagan. The initial polls showed the people opposed his actions in Grenada, but within days, no, hours, that opinion changed.

The Communists are bent on revolution throughout Central America and Ronald Reagan knows it. You and I know it. And soon the people of America will know it as well.

If you vote against the President's peace proposal next Tuesday because you think it is politically popular, remember those who opposed President Reagan's Grenada rescue mission ended with egg on their face. This vote will come back to haunt you if you make the same mistake again. We will make sure of that.

The next time you may lose your political head.

SANITATION STANDARDS FOR FARM WORKERS

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that most of the Nation's farmworkers have never had sanitary standards. After OSHA's refusal to promulgate sanitation standards, one wonders if OSHA really stands for Occupational Safety and Health Administration. There are thousands of pages of evidence that documents a high incidence of infectious and parasitic diseases, toxic disorders, and other ailments that are caused by a lack of fresh water and rest rooms. I say to all of my colleagues, we cannot turn away from these workers, whose working conditions compare only to certain areas of the Third World. OSHA has dismissed the plight of thousands of farmworkers as if they lacked the human dignity we claim to accord to everyone. How are these workers to wash the pesticides from their hands, to quench their thirst, and relieve themselves during the day. According to OSHA these necessities are not a top priority. What are the priorities, Mr. Speaker? The people of this country can figure this out. Why can't OSHA.

I appeal to the Secretary of Labor designate, Mr. William E. Brock to immediately issue regulations for field sanitation standards for farmworkers. I also appeal to Mr. Brock to ask for the resignation of OSHA Director Robert Rowland, who had the audacity to say to the Federal appeals court he was not aware of a report by OSHA's own health expert's which recommended the sanitation standard.

On April 17, I went to the Department of Labor to offer a rebuttal and was shocked at being refused access to the building. Mr. Speaker, I believe we might expect such action from the South African Embassy, but not here on Capitol Hill. Why was a Member of Congress prohibited from entering the Department of Labor. I want an answer to this question, and I want to see labor standards issued now.

AID TO THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS IN NICARAGUA

(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, next week we will vote on the critical issue of the U.S. assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. There are some people who say this is not America's business and, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you yes, it is America's business because America is a nation that was founded on an idea, on a principle that all men are created equal and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Not just Americans, but all men.

□ 1140

And, Mr. Speaker, history proves that all men know they have such an endowment of rights because throughout history all men have been willing to fight for their freedom and, failing in that fight, all men have shown that they are willing to vote then with their feet to move to a better place, and a better place indeed has proven historically to be the United States.

Should the people in South America not get the assistance they need to win this fight for their freedom, for their right to live free in their own land, they almost certainly will run free and they will run north to the U.S. border, to that haven that has been proven throughout history.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be faced with the moral dilemma of having failed to give the assistance of materials to these people at a time when they were fighting for their freedom, to have to stand at our border and deny them the freedom and the right to come to our country, as they most certainly will try, as people throughout the world have most certainly done in the past.

I thank the Speaker.

COVERT AID TO NICARAGUA

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

Mr. AcCOIN. Mr. Speaker, knowing that aid to the Contras was "dead in the water" in Congress, the administration has pulled a new Nicaraguan peace plan out of its hat: For 60 days, American covert aid would be strictly "humanitarian." After that, barring a negotiated settlement, the aid would become military.

What a plan. Who supports it? Not the Contadora nations who have worked for 2 years on an agreement to ease tensions in Central America. Not Colombian President Betancur who said that covert aid is "a preparation for war." By the way, you don't hear leaders like him calling the CIA-backed rebels as freedom lovers who are desired to Thomas Jefferson!

The only people who like the peace plan are White House strategists who dreamed it up to get Congress to release the $14 million. Mr. Speaker, in the upside down world of this Administration. This plan should be called a peace threat.

This is a no-lose situation for the administration, and a no-win situation for Central America. It assures the Contras $14 million in military aid—if they don't reach an agreement with the Sandinistas. And, until the charade of negotiations is over. The Contras will get "humanitarian" aid such as trucks, uniforms, and logistical support.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as humanitarian aid to a mercenary army. Especially an army that the President says he wants to increase in "size and effectiveness" if he wins this $14 million kitty.

Mr. Speaker, let's end the covert war and push for a policy that can bring peace to Central America.

THE TASK FORCE HAS RUN AMOK

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, when discussing the Eighth District race in Indiana in recent weeks we have heard the Democrats talking all the time about "Let's count all the ballots." We did not know until yesterday just how far they are prepared to go on that, because now we find that counting all the ballots means reaching into the next district, finding a Democratic ballot over there for Mr. LEE HAMILTON and counting that for Mr. McCloskey. In the count yesterday we found out that they got a ballot that was evi-

dently wrongly distributed but, nevertheless, has LEE HAMILTON's name on it, where they voted straight Democratic. But they decided now to count that vote for Mr. McCloskey, saying that the guy who voted for Mr. HAMILTON really meant to vote for Mr. McCloskey in that race.

That one vote could be the difference in this race, it is that close. I suggest that a task force that is going to count ballots cast for one person for someone else is a task force that has run amok. The kinds of things we have seen happening with this task force's voting rules and the rules they have set up for counting just has become an issue that is absolutely ridiculous.

LIMITING SHELTERING OF OFF-FARM INCOME TO $25,000 PER YEAR

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will limit to $25,000 per year the amount of off-farm income which could be sheltered by farm losses.

This legislation will close a tax loophole which is aggravating our mounting agricultural crisis. This is a way to help our family farmers and save the Government money at the same time. Farmers and ranchers not only have to deal with low commodity and livestock prices, high interest rates and declining agricultural exports, but they also must compete with so-called gentleman farmers who are more interested in farming the Tax Code than in producing food and fiber. These investors use tax benefits from farming, such as investment tax credits or depreciation on farm equipment and livestock, to shelter nonfarm income.

Tax investors compete with genuine farmers and ranchers for farm and ranch land, add to surplus production problems, and sometimes farm marginal lands, thus aggravating soil and water conservation problems. This legislation will go a long way toward restoring commonsense to our Nation's tax policy as it applies to agriculture. Overproduction due to tax-beneficial investments by nonfarmers results in lower prices for consumers, but devastates legitimate farmers. Meanwhile, farmers with no income to shelter get no benefits. My legislation protects farmers who need nonfarm income in order to stay afloat over the long term by excluding from the tax-loss limitation farmers with nonfarm income if they are actually in the business of farming to make a profit and if they received the greatest share of their income from farming in 3 of the past 7 years.

Current tax programs stimulate production, while farm programs prop up prices, subsidize farmers, and pay them not to grow more food. Tax policy throws farm production out of sync by bringing in investors who care less about farming than they do about sheltering outside income from taxes. My bill is a good opportunity to add some revenues to the Federal coffers while sending some absentee farmers to look for shelter somewhere else.

THE EVOLVING RATIONALE FOR CONTRA AID

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

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, let us review for 1 minute the conveniently evolving rationale for Contra aid.

First, we were told that it was to help interdict Nicaragua arms shipments to Salvador guerrillas.

Then we were told that it was to put external pressure on the Sandinistas to honor their revolution's goals.

Those early rationales proved false when we learned the CIA was conducting a deadly war inside Nicaragua, shooting unarmed civilians and officials, publishing assassination manuals, mining harbors, and blowing up economic targets—terrorism sponsored and financed by the CIA, in violations of the Boland amendment, international law, and the Treaty of Rio.

Twice Congress said no to this policy. We turned off the financial spigot.

Last March we learned of a new rationale for Contra aid when President Reagan and Secretary Shultz admitted that the real goal was to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government.

Now the President has a new rationale with a ribbon tied around it called peace talks.

The real issue here is not the $14 million itself, regardless of how packaged. It is: Do we want to turn on that spigot again?

Once we do, we once again head down the road of overthrowing an internationally recognized sovereign government—a return to Yankee style "might makes right" which hurts us badly in the region—a policy which brushes aside the Contradora opportunity of negotiated settlement.

It is a policy that the American people disapprove of and Congress has rejected twice.

Congress must say no again.

□ 1150

FUNDING THE CONTRAS WILL MAKE THE PROBLEM OF NICARAGUA WORSE, NOT BETTER

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Central America has two problems: poverty and war. Reagan's proposal means more of both.

I was in a God-forsaken refugee camp in the hills of Nicaragua last week, and Lucia Zamora, a woman who has lost three nephews to the Contras, came up to me and said, Please don't send more money to the Contras. We need it more here, in the villages.

These are the people whose lives are being destroyed. Not by the Cubans, not by the Soviets. They are being destroyed by the Contras and their war. Do not compare the Sandinistas to the Almighty; compare them to the alternative.

Funding the Contras will make the problem of Nicaragua worse and not better. President Reagan may be trying to prevent another Cuba, but his policy is going to create another Cuba.

If we want humanitarian assistance to Nicaraguan refugees, we will have the chance to debate that later.

Let us not let the President muddy the water.

The question is crystal clear: The issue is $14 million for war in Nicaragua. The vote is yes or no.

REAGAN ADMINISTRATION APPOINTEES ATTACK PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday two Department of Education appointees of the Reagan administration had the following to say about programs for handicapped people.

Mrs. Gardner said:

> What happens to a person in life, the circumstances a person is born into . . . those circumstances are there to help the individual grow toward internal spiritual perfection.

Then Mr. Uzzell testified that he once again was urging that the 1975 law for the education of handicapped children be abolished.

Well, whatever one's religious beliefs might be, those two statements are not ones of morality but are statements of moral bankruptcy. Those beliefs do not stand for the law and the rights of the individual but instead result in the law of the jungle.

There is still a sense of community in this country. I hope, as urged by the gentleman from California yesterday on this floor, that Mrs. Gardner's appointment will be withdrawn.

PROTECT OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American Association of Retired Persons has estimated that a typical retired couple will see its Social Security and Medicare benefits cut by more than $2,000 over the next 4 years if the revised White House budget is implemented. The AARP further estimates that permanently lowering Social Security benefits by 6 percent would force almost 1 million additional elderly below the poverty line over the next 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to steal $22.6 billion over the next 3 years from our senior citizens when Social Security is financially sound and funded out of its own trust fund, and not out of general revenues. Cutting Social Security will not reduce the deficit, it will only increase the surplus in the Social Security trust fund.

As responsible legislators it is our duty to put this so-called Diet COLA where it belongs—in the can. I urge all of my colleagues to reassure their senior citizens that their COLA's are safe by cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 116.

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 128 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 128

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1617) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, each section of said substitute shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI and section 303(a)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. TORRES]. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 128 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1617, the National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act, for fiscal year 1986. It is an open rule, providing for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. The resolution makes in order the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and provides that each section shall be considered as read.

There are several waivers of points of order in this rule, Mr. Speaker. The first waiver is of the 3-day layover rule for committee reports. Although the Committee on Science and Technology ordered the bill reported on April 3, the report was not actually filed until Tuesday, April 16. Since the printed copy of the report has not been available for the required 3 days, the waiver of rule XI, clause 2(l)(6) is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, points of order are also waived under section 303(a)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act—which provides that it shall not be in order to consider any bill which provides new entitlement authority first effective in a fiscal year until the first budget resolution for such fiscal year has been adopted. Section 6 of H.R. 1617, as reported, provides new entitlement authority by setting the rate of compensation for the Director of the Bureau at level 4 of the Executive Schedule. Since this new entitlement authority is first effective in fiscal year 1986 and since no conference report on the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1986 has been adopted, the bill violates section 303(a)(4) of the Budget Act. However, the Committee on Science and Technology intends to offer a floor amendment during this violation.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 128 also provides a waiver of clause 5 of rule XXI to allow consideration of the committee substitute. That rule prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. H.R. 1617 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to acquire capital equipment and inventories with receipts for work or services performed. Since the provision makes existing funds available for a new purpose, it is construed as an appropriation. Again, it is our understanding that the Committee on Science and Technology will offer a floor amendment that will cure this violation. Mr. Speaker, upon conclusion of consideration of the bill, one motion to recommit with or without instructions would be in order.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1617 authorizes $143.9 million for the activities of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1986, as follows: $139.9 million for programs conducted at the National Bureau of Standards, $2.8 million for the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, and $537,000 for the National Technical Information Services. In addition, H.R. 1617 restores three centers which have received strong bipartisan support by the Congress but which have been proposed for elimination or reduction. They are the Center for Fire Research, the Center for Building Technology, and the Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology.

The Committee on Science and Technology voted to restore $9.7 million for these two critically important centers and also restored $5 million to the funding level to the Institute for Computer Sciences. This institution plays a critical role in improving our Nation's use of computer and telecommunication technology.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and I urge support of House Resolution 128 so that we may proceed with this important legislation that would allow the National Bureau of Standards to conduct the programs that Congress mandated.

□ 1200

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 128 waives three points of order against consideration of the 1986 authorization bill for the National Bureau of Standards. That bill, H.R. 1617, is yet another example of the failure of our committees to even attempt to reduce Federal spending.

This rule is yet another example of the failure of the Rules Committee to require the legislative committees to live up to the requirements of the Budget Act. The rule also offers another sad example of our failure to force legislative committees to comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a prescription for bad legislative procedure. The

fact that it provides a whole set of waivers for a bill that contains excessive increases in the budget points out the necessity for the House to stop this practice of business as usual.

The resolution waives the 3-day layover rule against consideration of the bill. Despite the fact that the Committee on Science and Technology reported the bill 2 weeks ago, they did not file their report in the House until Tuesday. With this waiver, the Members will be asked to work on a bill that has been available only since yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the availability of the bill and the committee report, I would also point out that even the Committee on Rules did not have the final printed versions of them when we met Tuesday morning to report this rule.

This resolution waives the Budget Act, because the Committee on Science and Technology wants to provide a pay raise to the Director of the National Bureau of Standards, but does not have the necessary new entitlement authority to do so.

The resolution also waives clause 5(a) of rule 21 of the rules of the House, because the committee substitute contains appropriations language in a legislative bill in violation of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two good things one can say about House Resolution 128: It is an open rule and it does provide for one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The rule will allow an amendment or amendments to reduce the level of authorization for the Bureau of Standards, such as the budget freeze proposal to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Committee on Science and Technology, H.R. 1617 authorizes an increase of $20.7 million over the budget request of the administration. The authorization level contained in the bill is $143.9 million, an amount that is a $16 million increase over the current funding level.

The bill is opposed by the administration, and it should be opposed by the Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress doesn't put a stop to this kind of spending authorization, we will never be able to deal effectively with the growing Federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample reason to oppose this rule. Because of the three waivers recommended by the Committee on Rules, this rule is bad legislative procedure. On the other hand, because it is an open rule, it is fair to those who want to attempt to hold the line on Federal spending and reduce the authorization levels in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this rule in the Rules Committee and I oppose it now, both for procedural and substantive reasons. We considered this bill in the Rules Committee in violation of our own committee rule that requires 24-hour advance availability of bills and reports. Now, we are being asked in this rule to put the House at the same disadvantage by waiving the House rule that requires that reports be available for 3 days before legislation can be considered on the floor. We should not condone flying blind and voting blind, either in committee or on the floor. It's no way to legislate in the world's greatest deliberative body.

But this rule contains other waivers that point more to the substantive faults in this bill. Not only do we waive the House rule that prohibits appropriations in an authorization, but we waive the Budget Act prohibition on new entitlement authority being enacted before adoption of the first budget resolution. Those waivers are necessary because this bill contains authority for salary increases—yes, salary increases at a time when we are talking about freezing Federal salaries.

The Committee on Science and Technology tells us in its report that this bill authorizes $143.9 million, plus such other sums as may be necessary for the pay raises. According to the CBO estimate in the report, that will cost another $2.3 million for a total authorization of $146.2 million. That's $18.4 million or 14.4 percent more than last year's spending.

So this legislation is not just a procedure-buster, but a budget-buster as well. It's actually $21.4 million over the budget request of $122.5 million.

If my colleagues are experiencing a sense of déja vu over this legislation, it is well justified: You have indeed been here before—just a year ago this month. At that time, the Science Committee brought us a fiscal 1985 authorization that was some $6.7 million over the administration's request. The House, in its wisdom, adopted the Gregg amendment to reduce spending to the level requested by the administration, at which time the Science Committee pulled the bill. But the Gregg amendment was upheld when we resumed consideration. Despite our valiant efforts, we subsequently agreed to some objectionable amendments from the other body that prompted a veto at the end of the 98th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately, we will have an opportunity again this year to strike a blow for fiscal sanity and deficit reduction. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] will be offering amendments to cut back the authorization level to the administration's request of $122.5 million—a $21.4 million reduction and for a freeze at the fiscal year 1985 level. I strongly support this amendment and hope the House will demonstrate the same courage and foresight it demonstrated last year on the NBS bill when it adopted a similar amendment. Otherwise, I fear our sense of déja vu will be completely fulfilled with another Presidential veto. And make no mistake about it—the administration is opposed to this bill in its present form. Let's support the Walker amendment to bring this back to the level of funding requested in the budget and continue with our deficit reduction efforts.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], a member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to congratulate him and the gentleman from Massachusetts for pointing out accurately that this bill does indeed contain a budget waiver.

Now, it is my understanding that out of my committee we are going to have an appropriate amendment that cures that budget waiver problem. But I will say that I am going to try to point out each and every time we come to the floor with these budget waivers and I am going to try to bring to the House's attention that these budget waivers cumulatively are what are resulting in the kinds of spending problems we have got around this House, that over and over again the Rules Committee is allowing budget waivers to come through, that then we get authorization in appropriations that far exceed what we say in the budget we are going to spend. Those figures are not small figures. In the last 5 years this Congress has overspent its own budgets by $150 billion. We have added $150 billion to the national debt over and above what we said we were going to spend simply because on a regular basis we have waived the Budget Act, on a regular basis we have come in here with supplemental appropriations with budget waivers to them, and consistently what we have set out is a budget and then on the other hand set out a pattern that simply violates that budget time after time after time.

Personally, this Member is getting a little sick of this idea around here that we politically run around the country telling everybody all this good stuff we are doing on the budget and then have the pattern of operation around here a waiver of the Budget Act on every conceivable item that comes before us.

□ 1210

In this particular case, we are going to end up trying to correct it within the legislation. Thank goodness, thank goodness. But it is a pattern that we see around here all the time, that we play the politics of the budget out there, but the fact is we really do not want to obey it.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri for pointing out to the House that indeed we are proceeding right along that course with this bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts also mentioned in his remarks that we have a budget waiver in here. Again, I say I am thankful we are going to correct it in this particular case, but I would hope that the Rules Committee would begin to say flatly to the people coming before them that we are not going to accept your budget waivers anymore.

If this House cannot live within its own rules, then we better change the rules. If we cannot live within our own procedures, then we better change the procedures. But we ought not let this pattern go on where we fool people with the budget only to violate that budget day after day after day.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We should lay out what we are talking about here on this budget waiver question, because the way it has been set out, it would seem like a floodgate was opened through which a lot of money is pouring.

As I understand it, we are going to be proposing a technical amendment which will bring this bill back into conformity with the Budget Act, and the only effect of that technical amendment would be that the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Standards would be made comparable with other national laboratory directors, an amount of $3,600 the spending of which is not in dispute, but simply the account from which it will be drawn from a different account.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We are talking about a very technical amendment here, and there will be no change in the amount of money that is spent because of the budget waiver that the Budget Committee included in this rule.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman is absolutely correct. My question here is more one of process than of substance, because if this were the only budget waiver we were going to consider, I would not have so much problem. The fact is that this is part of a pattern that I am really referring to.

I would point out to the gentleman though that $3,600 represents the entire tax bill of one average American family in this country. So for that particular family, the fact that we are including a budget waiver for $3,600 is in fact a big amount of money.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALGREN. I would spend an awful lot of time in pursuit of $3,600. I think that is a significant amount of money. No amount of money is small in this body, and that is not a small amount of money. I do appreciate the gentlemen's point on process; I think that is a good point. But we should not, or no one should take the impression that we are going to be reducing the amount of spending involved in the Bureau because of this technical amendment to the budget waiver process.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his point and I yield back my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science and Technology.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me give some perspective to the House as to what happened when we were in subcommittee and in committee. The bill that we came out with was $143 million. The administration had requested $122 million, but it turns out here that the 1985 level, instead of being $122 million, as the administration requested, is $127 million. About $5 million difference.

Now, what I understand will happen here today is that there will be an amendment offered to go back to the 1985 level, and then there will be an amendment that takes it down to the request level. The request level being $5 million below the 1985 level.

I think it is reasonable to support the amendment that takes it down to the request level. The agency has gone through all of the different things that they have to do to reduce their expenditures, and they have told us that $122 million is an amount that they can live with.

Why do we need to stuff $5 million down their throats that they did not even ask for, and that, if you take their word, that they do not need? I think we set a precedent in the two bills that we had last week and yesterday, the NASA authorization and the National Science Foundation; those bills were brought down to the 1985 level.

Now, in this one, do we bring it down to the 1985 level or the agency's request? I think we would be smart to take the position that whichever is the lower of the two figures, that that is the amount that we should fund. The National Bureau of Standards, the National Science Foundation, NASA; those are all agencies that I feel very kindly toward. If we were going to give an increase to any of them, those would be as deserving as any of the others because that is where the future jobs will come from.

However, we have got to be realistic in this whole budget process that our primary objective here is to reduce expenditures, and it would make a lot of sense to me that if the agency has said all we need is $122 million, why should we give them $127 million, and even worse, why should we give them $143 million as it called for in the bill?

As they say, some of my friends are for $127 million.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. LUJAN. As the old saying goes, some of my friends are for $127 million; I will support that. Some of my friends are for $122 million; I am going to stick with my friends on that one also. But that then gives us a reduced amount down to the $122 million, and that is the lowest, and that is what the agency has said that they can spend and they would like.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am provoked into speaking on this rule because of the remarks of my good friend from New Mexico, who is being very generous in offering to go to the lowest possible level on this bill authorizing the National Bureau of Standards. I admire him for that. As I pointed out in connection with the debate on the NASA bill a few days ago, I hope that he will exercise similar discipline when a really important bill comes along like the defense bill.

If I were certain that he would, and that a majority of the House would, I would join him in his request here today. But I do not think that we are going to see that kind of discipline when it comes to the other bills. Hence, I am extremely reluctant to gut a bill for authorizing the program of an agency which is universally recognized as contributing a great deal to the welfare of this country; to its eco-

nomic development and to its scientific development.

I would like to clarify, just very briefly, some of the numbers that were mentioned here. The gentleman from New Mexico referred to the agency's request as being $122 million. Actually, the agency requested a figure of $226, as shown on page 5 of the committee report. It then went to the Department level, the Department of Commerce, which requested $146 million, above the level that is contained in this bill. Then it went to the Office of Management and Budget, which produced the final cut and gave us the figure that is in the President's budget.

Now, you may say that this is the agency's request; we know that it is not the agency's request, that it is the agency's request pared down by two further levels of review, and I just want to make that clear. We have not, in this authorization bill, gone back up to the agency's request, we have gone back to less than the Department of Commerce request to OMB, a request which was then cut back by OMB.

I think that the committee level is a reasonable level, and if you look at the specific programs that are incorporated in this legislation, they are programs of vital importance to the future of this country. There is a new biotechnology initiative, for example, which the entire biotechnology industry has recognized is of vital importance if we are going to maintain this industry on the path of growth which it seems to be taking.

There is an initiative there for new developments in materials technology, in ceramics. On the very floor of this House, in just the last year, we have had Members come in and add millions to fund the laboratories which are doing materials research, laboratories which will require the technical resources of the NBS and this program in order to monitor and to set the standards for the research they will be engaged in.

□ 1220

So there is no question about the value of the NBS programs, and I think my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, could recognize that. These programs were, as a matter of fact, requested by the administration at the same time that they requested cuts in the Center for Building Technology and the Center for Fire Research and in the Institute for Computer Analysis, which this House has repeatedly gone on record as supporting in the past.

So this is a little more complex problem than was represented by the gentleman from New Mexico, and I hope I have not said anything that contravenes anything that he has said.

Mr. LUJAN. No, if the gentleman would yield, because I do want to tell him that the gentleman is correct, that the work that goes on there is excellent.

I just wanted to answer one thing. Since the gentleman said he would probably join me if I were of the opinion that maybe we ought to freeze everything, including defense, let me tell the gentleman that I am prepared to support either the Presidential request or the 1985 level, whichever is the lowest, in all cases. So having said that, I assume that the gentleman would vote for the $122 million.

Mr. BROWN of California. I accept the gentleman's statement in good faith.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 128 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1617.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1225

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1617) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes, with Mr. MITCHELL (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1617. This bill would provide authorization for the National Bureau of Standards in the amount of $140 million, along with $2.8 million for the Office of Productivity Technology and Innovation, and $537,000 for the National Technical Information Service.

The vote in our committee on final passage showed strong bipartisan support for sustaining what are clearly important and unique functions at the Bureau of Standards, and I hope that the Members will think carefully about exactly what the National Bureau of Standards is all about.

The National Bureau of Standards is not a bureaucracy as its name would imply. It is a national laboratory, a national laboratory that is a unique and almost the sole source of excellence in its area of science in our country. It is in that sense a jewel in our crown and one that we undercut at our risk.

I hope that Members will stop to think of what we are talking about in the area of standards. At bottom, all science begins with measurement. If you are to conduct an experiment, you must observe what happens, and the way we observe is by measurement. We literally cannot know anything without being able to measure it. It is like in the Bible, we have a relationship with others only if we know their names, and a name was given to the Lord at a certain time in the Bible. The same is true in science. We have no power unless we can measure. It is the science of measurement that we are talking about. It is literally the linchpin to all scientific programs.

I hope that when we deal with the various efforts to reduce this budget that the Members will consider the importance of the measurement function of the Bureau of Standards. We should remember that, if we want the benefits of the laser technology that has been mentioned on the floor of the House several times recently, where we have hopes to be able to disssolve by lasers blockages in the human circulatory system, then we ought to support the science that is behind the tuning of the laser.

If we, as Members of Congress, want to write notes to people in the hospital and say we are glad they are recovering from a heart attack, we hope we should be able to also say that we supported the science that saved their lives, and not be in the position of saying we are glad you survived, but we don't really think you should have recovered.

If we want American manufacturing to be able to compete with foreign products, we should support the science that is behind the automation that is necessary. That is the science of measurement and the ability to create the microchips that are necessary in that area.

If we want to have any progress in the weapons systems of this country, I hope we realize that it was the Colt six-shooter that sort of established the need for standards. Without the concept of standards, the interchangeable

parts that led to the machinegun and the victory of the North over the South in the Civil War would not have been available to our country. In a very real sense, the mission of this laboratory is at the heart of the existence of the Nation.

Somebody said in our hearings, with a real grain of truth, that we could probably eliminate the budget of the Department of Commerce. I think there is probably a good argument that could be made by many that we ought to eliminate the Department of Commerce. But we would not be able to sustain our way of life if we eliminated the Bureau of Standards. There is a very real core of truth in that statement.

The administration has proposed an institutionally damaging budget of $120 million for the Bureau for 1986. This budget is $4 million lower than the 1985 appropriation. It contains $25 million in program reductions and $21 million, approximately, in new initiatives. The committee accepted the new initiatives proposed by the Bureau inasmuch as they were very much viewed as in the national interest. These include almost $2 million for process and quality control, $3 million for biotechnology, and $3.5 million for advanced ceramics.

In addition, the committee agreed with the administration decision to provide $8 million for construction of a new laboratory related to cold neutron source science. This involves a new level of measurement with the ability to evaluate the molecular structure of materials by a nondestructive cold neutron penetration and measurement of the effects thereof, rather than some of the destructive testing mechanisms we have which really do not tell us very much about the materials.

□ 1230

The NBS initiative in advanced ceramics is critical for the leading edge of our technology in the next several years, and that means our commercial technology. The ability of ceramics to contribute to the energy-related innovations by the development of new engines based on ceramics rather than metal is obvious to all observers, and we would fail to proceed in that area at our peril.

The initiative in biotechnology clearly is an area that is crying out for standards to enable the industry to function. In biotechnology, we need to measure things that have never existed before. Measurements of qualities of specific biologically active agents have to be developed, and there will be little progress in the industrialization of biotechnology until we do that. This is to outline how important these initiatives are to our national interest, and I hope the Members of the House of Representatives will support them.

Once again this year, the committee did not accept the administration's request that the Centers for Fire Research and Building Technology be eliminated. The Congress has never accepted the elimination of the Centers for Fire Research and Building Technology, even though it has been proposed several years in the past. Many of us are truly perplexed as to how a proposal could be made to eliminate these centers which have both contributed most important things to our national life and promise to do that in a magnified form in the future. In a sense, this almost seems to be a Washington Monument-type approach to the budget by the administration, where they propose eliminations that cannot be accepted on their face. When we consider the role of the Center for Fire Research, for example, in the development for the low-head sprinkler system which we hope will be the lifesaver for residential fire death in this country, it becomes obvious that this is an area that we should certainly not be wiping out, as the administration's budget proposes.

Second, the Center for Fire Research is now embarked on one of the most exciting adventures in the control of fire death in our time, the computer modeling of the progress of fires so that homes can be constructed not only in a most cost-effective way but in a way that takes into account the way a fire would move and would, therefore, be able to protect people in those structures by the construction of the building in a way that we have never been able to do in the past.

The fact that the United States has the highest death rate from fire in the industrial world among all nations comparable to our society is a disgrace, and it literally would be a disgrace, with the lives that will be lost to fire if we back up and wipe out that Center for Fire Research.

The same thing can be said about the Center for Building Technology. Nothing has more concretely, on a cost-effective basis, contributed to the well-being of the American public than the Center for Building Technology. In one little measure, the development of an insulation measurement technique that allowed the building industry to save literally $90 million a year, the Center for Building Technology justified its existence ad infinitum. If we take the $90 million that the American public saved from the single development alone, and put it in an endowment, it would give us year by year the $5 million that we invest in the whole range of building technology functions that are carried out. And there is a host of them that would be absolutely essential and would not be picked up in any other way.

The Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology is authorized in the bill at the rate of $10 million. The administration cut that by about $5 million on the rationale that somehow or other we should limit their involvement to international computer standards. I support their involvement in international computer standards. I am remembering in years past that the administration did not support the international program despite the fact that we would be left out of a multitrillion-dollar business as France and other countries occupy the rest of the world in computer technology if we do not engage in the international development of standards.

But the domestic contribution of the Center for Computer Standards and Computer Technology is absolutely essential. It is the only place where we now, as a Government, go for up-to-the-moment solutions of computer problems for Government computer work. The fact is that we are saving the taxpayer money head over heels in the application of computer technology to Government work. To simply remove ourselves from any ability to do that in the best way we can is to tie our hands behind our backs and just engage in wholesale waste.

The bill also has in it $2.5 million for steel research. This is not additional spending. This is money set aside in one of the research directorates within the basic authorization. But this is a most important effort that the Bureau of Standards is able to contribute to. If we are not going to protect our producers in this country from imported goods, either steel or otherwise, the least we can do is put them on an equal footing with respect to the other kinds of advantages that foreign producers have. One of the most important of these is at least the cooperative help of Government science skills in helping to advance the technology of their industry.

If our wage standards and our living standards are to be equal to the rest of the world, we have to produce smarter. The only way we can produce smarter in the steel industry is to have the kinds of initiatives and the forces of scientific talent that are provided in this bill so that we can produce "smarter" and essentially "leapfrog" the present methods of producing steel. We must do better than the rest of the world in the use of our scientific knowledge so that our producers will be able to be competitive even though they support the living standards of the United States of America rather than those of South Korea or Taiwan.

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

Mr. WALGREN. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this initiative is a unique initiative that has been functioning, and it has brought leading scientists from the steel industry together on problems of common interest so as to develop the kinds of new technologies that make our steel industry once again preeminent in the world.

I think what the Members of this body need to recognize is the extraordinary amount of industrial cooperation stimulated by the governments of our foreign competition. Nowhere is this truer than in the country of Japan where scientists and engineers and technologists from various competing industrial entities combine together to work on common problems, solve those common problems, go on to compete with one another, and then go on to compete in the world with countries like the United States.

We do this to a very limited extent, and the small program within the Bureau of Standards which has been so successful in bringing these industry scientists together is something we can look to with pride.

I might add that the National Bureau of Standards has provided a kind of model framework for other National Government research and development facilities when it comes to having industry scientists work together on common problems, solve those common problems, and then go off in their various competitive directions. That is something that I just mentioned that is carried on by our competition. There is a range of industrial competitive efforts brought together by the National Bureau of Standards which extends beyond the steel industry to other basic industries in this country. It is my opinion that the Federal research and development economy must acknowledge these kinds of successes and must in other Federal laboratory facilities move toward the kinds of programs that have brought industry scientists and engineers together to solve common problems.

□ 1240

It is a worthy model and the successes are worthy of the support of the Members of Congress.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership in this area.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement and would like to be associated with his remarks and his fundamental appreciation of the contribution that the Bureau of Standards has made to our science and can make in the future to our industry.

I think one other point I would like to make or one last point I would like to make is that we will be dealing with various proposals to reduce this budget that have been brought forth out of the committee. As the gentleman from California said, the budget request that came from those who are most in touch with the programs within this national laboratory were some $40 million above the amount that was originally requested by the administration.

We have certain add-ons in this bill. We chose as a committee to respect the importance that the administration gave to the initiatives in ceramics and in other areas. At the same time, we were unable to give up the amounts that have been invested in the past in the Center for Fire Research and the Center for Building Technology and in the computer technology area.

This puts us in the position of having a bill in which the President is below the freeze level of last year's appropriations. We are, as a body, going to have to choose at what level we would respect and believe it is in the national interest for this budget.

I understand going to the freeze level. There is much to be said for that, inasmuch as this country has a large overall problem and we are trying to set precedents of restraint in this House. We will, at the appropriate time, be offering a budget which goes to the level of 1985 appropriations.

There are those in the body who want to go below that, that will either in their view go to 1985 freeze levels or the President's recommendations, whichever is lower.

I would like to say that those same individuals have not accepted the President's judgment about what is in the national interest in the area of NASA or in some of these initiatives that the President has recommended as important for the national interest.

It seems that the underlying rationale then to go below a freeze level is simply to vote for the lowest amount that is offered on the floor of the House of Representatives, whatever that might be.

I would hope that people would think twice about that, because that is essentially a very arbitrary approach to budgets that are as important to the national interest as this budget is.

"Daffy Duck," although he may not be a Member of Congress, could conceivably have an amendment offered on the floor of the House of Representatives which provided zero funding for this kind of effort; but the truth of the matter is that we would not respect that. We have an obligation as Members to try to preserve the value of these programs, make a judgment as to the level that is most appropriate in view of their contribution to the national interest. That may be a freeze level, but there is one thing it is not. It is not the lowest level that is ever offered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I would hope that people would approach this with a good deal of care and recognize that this may be the most important and interesting bill up yet, because we will have a choice between freezing at the 1985 level or going below the 1985 level to one that happened to be recommended by the President, but I would hope we would remember that we did not take the President's recommendations when he was above the 1985 levels and I would think that should make us think twice about whether we should take the President's recommendations in areas where he might be below.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Technology brings forward H.R. 1617, a bill to reauthorize the National Bureau of Standards and for other purposes.

The committee sought to report a bill having the greatest bipartisan support, doing so on a recorded vote of 30 to 7. I emphasize, however, that the conditions we faced in deciding the Bureau's budget were far different from that of the National Science Foundation. There were several new and exciting initiatives being proposed in the administration's submission to Congress. We, on a bipartisan basis, supported those administration initiatives. However, the total dollar amount for these initiatives were essentially equal to the proposed decreases. The administration's request for the Bureau for fiscal year 1986 is $120 million, including program increases totaling $16.4 million. The request also includes proposed program reductions of $16.5 million and decreases of $7.6 million attributed to the President's deficit reduction program and $1.2 million to carry out the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984.

For some 4 years now, the administration, in an effort to curb the growing deficit faced by this Nation, has proposed cuts in three programs which cause problems for members of this committee. They are: First, the Center for Fire Research; second, the Center for Building Technology, each of which have been slated for elimination; and third, the Institute for Computer Science and Technology which is slated for a 50-percent reduction. The committee has made a concerted effort to substantiate the justification which the administration states for the elimination of these programs. It is clear to the committee that no other entity will take on this effort and our record is very, very extensive. In the past, the full House, on a strong bipartisan basis, has supported the reinstatement in full of these three centers.

The administration is requesting some admirable increases for efforts at the Bureau. These proposed program increases are in process and quality

control measurements at a level of $1.9 million, a biotechnology initiative at $3 million, advanced ceramic activities at $3.5 million and a continued effort to establish a national center using the cold neutron facility, a fiscal year 1986 request of $8 million.

NBS is clearly a national resource which could be leveraged at a time when our American industries are competing quite vigorously in an international market. NBS offers a clear and distinct opportunity to link U.S. industry and commerce, to those factors which hinder their performance in the marketplace. In performing its functions, the Bureau of Standards must remain a state of the art, scientific organization. It must have the resources to interact with the industrial community as well as technical resources to promote and preserve the standardization problems facing American industry.

The United States is in a race for its technological life. That race is under way today, but it will continue well into the 21st century. NBS is a high-tech agency with an outstanding track record of working on key areas of industrial competitiveness and working closely with industry. The authorization for NBS which we bring before the full House will help foster the climate for American industrial competitiveness and U.S. resurgence in the world economy.

Unlike many other Federal agencies that operate national laboratories, the entire work force of the Bureau is the national laboratory. There is not an overflow in administration's GS level 11-15 employees. These people represent the meat, the technical support, the bench type scientists. Among all the Federal research establishments the National Bureau of Standards has done more to couple Federal R&D resources with the private sector than any other institution in the Federal Government.

They have exceeded the reasonable amount of funds an R&D agency should seek from other Federal agencies. In fiscal year 1985, $124 million was appropriated, however, this amount is being leveraged by sources reaching a level of $86 million.

Yet while the fiscal year 1986 proposal returns the Bureau to $120 million which was the level held through fiscal years 1982-84. Yet, again NBS will seek out sources of outside funding amounting to $89 million for fiscal year 1986. Even the Grace Commission, in its report to the President on cost control in the Government, recommends that the ratio of technicians to professionals in NBS laboratories be increased. They recommend that NBS leverage more university students as NBS technicians. Yet NBS does not, under the fiscal year 1986 proposed budget have the resources to implement this recommendation. In fact, during the period, from 1980 to present, full time equivalents [FTE] have gradually dropped from 3,659 in fiscal year 1980, to 3,079 in fiscal year 1986, leaving us 23 percent below fiscal year 1980 funding and a reduction of FTE's of 580 positions or 16 percent. The committee is greatly concerned with the ability of NBS to maintain and attract a quality scientific work force, as the Grace Commission would even recommend.

H.R. 1617 reauthorizes appropriations for the National Bureau of Standard [NBS], the Office of Productivity and Technology Innovation [OPTI], and the National Technical Information Service [NTIS].

As described by our subcommittee chairman, this bill authorizes $139.96 million for NBS. This figure accounts for the new initiatives proposed by the administration in process and quality control. Biotechnology ceramics and the beginning construction phase of the cold neutron facility.

In addition, the bill restores three centers which have received strong bipartisan support by the Congress but which were proposed for elimination or reduction. These are the Center for Fire Research, the Center for Building Technology, and Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology.

The bill restores $6.8 million of the $12.2 million cuts to the administrative and capital equipment budgets of NBS. The Office of Productivity and Technology Innovation received level funding in H.R. 1617 as compared to fiscal year 1985 appropriated levels and the request for the patent licensing program was accepted at the administration's request.

The subcommittee chairman, Mr. WALGREN and I have had discussions regarding the role of NTIS in Japanese translation of technical information, to make those resources more available within the United States.

In the past 2 years, this committee has authorized moneys for this effort, but appropriations did not occur. The chairman and I have agreed not to authorize new spending in section 2, section 9, or section 10(B) of the bill, because of the budgetary constraints the Federal Government faces.

Nevertheless, the committee continues to be concerned about the imbalance in the exchange of scientific and technical information between the United States and Japan. Significant advances in science and technology, along with a National policy of emphasis on R&D, are expected to continue in Japan in the coming years. The United States is not getting the benefit of this information, either to enhance its data bases or to understand better the relative technological strengths of United States and Japan, because it does not have an adequate system in place to explore properly these scientific and technical developments. The committee intends to pursue this issue further by exploring the possibility of using excess foreign currencies to allow the translation and dissemination of Japanese technical information and by holding congressional hearings later in the session on this issue. The committee strongly encourages the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Productivity, Technology and Innovation and the Director of NTIS to likewise pursue finding options to conduct this effort.

In closing, I would like to note that there has been considerable discussion between members of the Science and Technology Committee regarding the funding level of H.R. 1617. It is the belief of the majority of the members on the Science and Technology that the recommendation the committee wishes to bring to the floor is the most sound funding level NBS requires to accurately conduct the programs Congress mandated.

□ 1250

As I stated yesterday in this floor debate on the National Science Foundation authorization, I am not wedded to the mentality that we should freeze everything. I do not like deficit spending any more than any other of my colleagues here. But the last time I checked, we get paid a pretty good buck in this Congress, and I think we should establish some priorities.

The bills that we are dealing with on the floor of this House this week are extremely important to the future of this Nation, to guarantee that we can maintain our No. 1 position in terms of our industrial competitiveness. Once again, to trot out an old saw that you have heard from me many, many times, let us put things in perspective.

The total budget we are requesting for the National Bureau of Standards, this vital agency, so essential to American industry, the total budget we are requesting represents less than one-half cent per pack excise tax on cigarettes, and yet this Congress is standing idly by and on October 1 of this year the excise tax on cigarettes will go from 16 cents a pack to 8 cents a pack.

Now, you say that is no big deal. But every 1 penny in Federal excise tax on cigarettes generates $212 million for the U.S. Treasury.

I do not want deficit spending. I want to get at that deficit. The American people demand it.

But let us establish some sensible priorities. Let us put our money where our mouth is in terms of fostering the growth and dynamism of agencies like the National Bureau of Standards. And let us not give a 50-percent tax reduction to people who are misguided enough, like me, to smoke.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I can add to the extremely eloquent remarks made by the chairman of the subcommitee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN], and the ranking minority member of the subcommitee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. It is almost unique in my experience to see such well thought out, balanced, and eloquent statements coming from both the chairman and the ranking minority member about an agency and about a program brought before the floor of this House. As a matter of fact, I call to the attention of all of the Members the additional fact that even those who are going to propose the gutting of this bill are going to have words of praise for the Bureau, the very agency which they are proposing to gut.

Their reasons for the cuts they propose go beyond anything having to do with the agency and its work, which is widely recognized for its excellence and for the contribution which it makes to the highest priority problems of this Nation.

That is why I say that we are in a unique situation.

I want to point out a fact which has already been mentioned more than once as to why we are going to be confronted with an action which will be disastrous, and which I, for one, will not be able to support. The administration itself came in with a request for $16 million in additional funding for this agency, for the National Bureau of Standards, and then, continuing a game that they have been playing for the last 4 years, they proposed to cut out an equivalent amount of money for portions of the NBS Program which this House for the last 4 years has consistently put back.

In effect, the Office of Management and Budget is saying to us here in the Congress, "We are going to show you guys for not going along with us in the past. We are going to request the funds for the new programs that we think we need in the Bureau, vitally important to this Nation, and then we are going to take it out of your hide and see what you do about it." And that leaves us in the position of having an overall administration budget which is $16 million or $18 million less than it should be because they knew we would put that money back in for the programs which they cut.

Now, we may end up in a parlimentary situation in which we are going to achieve a result we don't want. In the words of the old song "You always hurt the one you love." And we are going to end up hurting the Bureau as a part of this game playing which is going on by the Office of Management and Budget.

Now, the actual facts are reflected in the committee report. I would like to request every Member of this House and everyone listening to my words to just read the first two or three paragraphs of that committee report. The actual programs covered by this bill, the funding for them last year was $135,802,000. That is at the second line of page 5 of the report. If we did what we did with NASA and with NSF, we would authorize that amount of money for the next year. That is a freeze. That is the same amount spent for these same programs last year.

What we are going to have before us are amendments to cut it back to $122 million or to $127 million, because of this game playing which is going on.

I personally think that the amount that the committee recommends for these programs, $143,869,000, roughly $8 million more than last year, or about 6 percent, is absolutely the minimum level that we ought to have. That $8 million add on is only half of the $16 million that the administration itself added on. I think it is a conservative way to go. And yet because of the parliamentary situation and this history of game playing, this Washington Monument syndrome referred to by the chairman of the subcommittee, OMB is going to get even with us and we are going to end up voting not for last year's dollar amount, $135 million, but something substantially below that.

I think that is ridiculous, and I think the OMB is to be condemned for that. I think that those of you here on this floor who have said that you are independent of the OMB, including my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] who has said that many times, ought to reject this ploy.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of California. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman well knows, we are not taking OMB's figures in my amendment either. We are taking their overall spending approach, but we defined the priorities in almost the same way as the committee defined the priorities, except at the lower levels. And so I would say to the gentleman that I am very sensitive to the work that the committee did in terms of defining priorities, and am not sensitive to OMB's priorities. I just feel their spending level is one that we ought to think about in this House, and certainly ought to have a vote on.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of California. Would the gentleman respond to this question: If this House were to be thoroughly consistent with what it did on NASA and NSF, which was to vote last year's funding level, would we not be voting on the figure that NSB and the other related agencies spent last year of $135,800,000?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, the gentleman knows well that the situation is somewhat different. In both of those instances the freeze figure was lower than the figure requested by the administration.

The administration had prioritized some of those science programs at higher levels, which I know the gentleman was pleased by the administration's increasing priority there. The House decided that we wanted to bring it down to the lower figure, which was the 1985 figure.

In this case what we have is the administration saying that we think as the people who run the programs that we can spend even less than what we spent in 1985, and so the question before the House is whether or not you want to have a lower figure than what is in the freeze. And my proposal is going to be that we ought to give to the administration that amount of money which they say they need in order to administer the program.

Mr. BROWN of California. But would not the gentleman sympathize with my characterization of the OMB action here as a little game playing when they add in $16 million in new programs, and then cut out the equivalent amount that the House has voted for the last 4 years?

□ 1300

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

That is the reason why in my amendment we switch around those priorities because what we have done we have taken and moved toward the committee priorities in my amendment to reflect the fact that we do think there was some game playing going on in there and that we ought to come closer to what the committee has determined to do in some of these programatic areas.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] for pointing out that essentially what we are dealing with here is an investment in our future, an investment in competitiveness. The NBS is probably the Federal laboratory that shows the greatest col-

laboration and cooperation between industrial research and public-supported research. If you compare this to the cost of the R&D tax credit which I happen to support, I think that this is really a prudent investment and to cut out such things as advanced ceramics which are targeted by the Japanese and where our world market share has been consistently falling to where we now have less than 50 percent—to cut another $1.5 million out of that research in this amendment process—would, to my way of thinking, be really foolish. Biotechnology, is the same.

If you want to cut out the Center for Fire Research, I would ask you to go back home and talk to your volunteer firemen; if you want to cut out the Center for Building Technology, go out to Kansas City to talk to the people who suffered from the structural defects in that hotel out there.

So we are not talking about a lot of money, but we are talking about an investment in this country's industrial competitiveness.

I believe the gentleman has made that point very well but I wanted to echo his remarks and perhaps expand slightly upon them.

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I rise in support of H.R. 1617, and in opposition to amendments to reduce the authorization level for the National Bureau of Standards. At the $143.9 million authorization level approved by the Science and Technology Committee, the Bureau represents a relatively small but important investment in the Nation's standards and measurements work. The Bureau's programs contribute to ensuring our competitiveness in foreign markets, to understanding hazards such as fires and earthquakes, and provides a resource for State and local governments in standards work involving safety programs. In short, the National Bureau of Standards is perhaps the best example of getting the best bang for the Federal buck. The Bureau's programs should be supported enthusiastically and without reservation.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the administration continues to advocate the elimination of important programs such as the Fire Research Program and the Center for Building Technology. Countless witnesses have testified that neither the States nor the private sector are equipped to conduct this type of research independently. Each year that the administration has proposed the elimination of these programs the Science Committee has restored them.

The Center for Fire Research provides the scientific and technical basis for efforts to reduce the Nation's fire losses and the cost of fire protection. The program develops the technical basis for improved practices for fire hazard assessment, prediction, and reduction. It is directed especially toward reducing the problem of residential fires which account for the majority of fire-related deaths and injuries in the United States. The committee has received testimony from a wide variety of witnesses refuting the argument that this type of research can be conducted by individual States or the private sector. These witnesses have provided substantial evidence that if the Bureau stopped its work in this area, no one else could or would do it. The administration's insistence on elimination of the Fire Research Program is the height of irresponsibility. I strongly support the committee's action in restoring funds for this program.

I also strongly support restoration by the committee of funds for the Center for Building Technology. This program has also been proposed for elimination for the third consecutive year by the administration. Research conducted at the Center provides the technical basis for voluntary standards, building codes, and specifications through development of improved measurement techniques, test methods, and technicals data not available from other sources. The Bureau is in a unique position to provide unbiased and pertinent information in this field. The private sector and State and local governments cannot or will not carry out nonproprietary technical research needed in this area. The Bureau also has a key role to play in the National Earthquakes Hazards Reduction Program. It provides reseach and technical support for the development of seismic design and construction provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I support the restoration of funds by the Committee for the Institute for Computer Science and Technology which the administration again tried to cut in half. The mission of ICST is essential to the development and implementation of a coherent national information policy and to the management of Federal information resources. ICST also plays an important role in increasing the competitiveness of U.S. telecommunications, computer and information products and services; in increasing the acceptance of international technical standards based on U.S. technology; and in improving the Federal Governments use of computer and telecommunication technology.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. LUJAN].

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this bill authorized $140 million for the National Bureau of Standards, $2.8 million for the Office of Productivity Technology and Innovation and $537,000 for the National Information Center. This totals $143.3 million which is $20 million above the President's request and $16 million above the 1985 level.

The bill prompted considerable debate in committee and was passed by a vote of 30 to 7. Those of us who opposed the bill felt an increase of more than 40 percent was excessive in a year of budget constraints.

While I share those reservations, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we should make it clear that these reservations do not reflect opposition to the basic goals of the National Bureau of Standards. NBS's role is well documented not only in the scientific community but in everyday life.

The differences instead reflect a question over the depth of involvement in certain fields. We know there will be an amendment to freeze funding at the 1985 level which would result in a reduction of $16 million. It should be noted, however, that freezing the funding at the 1985 level would still be $4.7 million over the President's request.

The administration has requested $8 million to begin construction on a cold neutron source. There is a need to get started on this facility and I certainly support this position. But we must face the reality of a deficit and a need to keep spending under control and we certainly stand ready to abide by the will of this body and I would hope that any budget reduction would not indicate a lack of support for this program.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel free in saying that we on this side of the aisle expect a lively debate on this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I will make one other point and that is about some of the programs that the administration, and I assume when we say the administration, the National Bureau of Standards is part of the executive branch of this body, that not only because certain research programs have been going on but that they would have to be continued ad infinitum.

The time comes when you must choose between programs because of budget constraints, and the National Bureau of Standards has told us in their request that they have made those choices and that some programs need to go because some are more worthy than others.

I am not saying that the type of research that has been going on there

and which is now slated for cutting out are not worthy programs; they certainly are. But, you know, among worthy programs, there are worthier programs.

But we have to take a strong look and be realistic about the types of programs that we can afford.

I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. PEASE]. The gentleman has consumed 3 minutes.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each section shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Bureau of Standards Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1986".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, following section 1, is as follows:

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

SEC. 2. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") for fiscal year 1986, to carry out activities performed by the National Bureau of Standards, the sums set forth in the following line items:

(1) Measurement Research and Standards, $39,985,000.

(2) Materials Science and Engineering, $23,184,000.

(3) Engineering Measurements and Standards, $34,846,000.

(4) Computer Science and Technology, $10,000,000.

(5) Center for Fire Research, $5,827,000.

(6) Technical Competence Fund, $8,745,000.

(7) Central Technical Support, $9,368,000.

(8) Cold Neutron Source Facility, $8,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act for fiscal year 1986—

(1) of the total amount authorized under paragraph (2) of subsection (a), not less than $2,500,000 shall be available for steel technology;

(2) of the total amount authorized under paragraph (3) of subsection (a), not less than $3,895,000 shall be available for the Center for Building Technology, and not less than $3,000,000 shall be available for Robotics;

(3) of the total of the amounts authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), (7), and (8) of subsection (a), not less than $5,608,000 shall be available for transfer to the Working Capital Fund; and

(4) of the total of the amounts authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), not less than $3,000,000 shall be available for an Evaluated Engineering Data Base.

(c)(1) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in subsection (a) so long as the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in such subsection.

(2) In addition, the Secretary may propose transfers to or from any line item exceeding 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in subsection (a); but a full and complete explanation of any such proposed transfer and the reason therefor must be transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and the proposed transfer may be made only when 30 calendar days have passed after the transmission of such written explanation.

(3) No transfer described in paragraph (1) or (2) may have the effect of reducing the amount available for any of the particular purposes set forth in subsection (b) below the applicable dollar amount specified in that subsection.

(d) The National Bureau of Standards shall seek reimbursements of not less than $500,000 from other Federal agencies to expand its efforts in support of basic scientific research on the atmospheric, climatic, and environmental consequences of nuclear explosions and nuclear exchanges.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENSES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 3. In addition to the sums authorized in section 2, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1986 the sum of $600,000 for expenses of the National Bureau of Standards incurred outside the United States, to be paid for in foreign currencies that the Secretary of the Treasury determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

SEC. 4. In addition to the sums authorized in the preceding provisions of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1986 such additional sums as may be necessary to restore the salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits of the National Bureau of Standards to the levels in effect at the end of fiscal year 1985 and to make any adjustments in the Bureau's salary, pay, retirement, and other employee benefits which may be provided for by law.

COST RECOVERY AUTHORITY

SEC. 5. (a) Section 12(f) of the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 278b(f)), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and second to ensure the availability of working capital necessary to replace equipment and inventories to the extent provided in advance in appropriation Acts".

(b) Fees for calibration services, standard reference materials, and other comparable services provided by the National Bureau of Standards shall be at least sufficient to meet the requirements set forth in the amendment made by subsection (a), and any funds recovered in excess of such requirements shall be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) (and the provisions of subsection (b)) shall be effective October 1, 1985.

COMPENSATION OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 6. (a) Section 5 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 274), is amended—

(1) by striking out "He" at the beginning of the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "The Director"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Director shall be compensated at the rate now or hereafter in effect for Level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.".

(b)(1) Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.".

(2) Section 5316 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Director, National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce.".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective October 1, 1985.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

SEC. 7. (a) In order to secure the services of the broadest possible range of talent in carrying out the programs of the National Bureau of Standards, the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 271-278h), is further amended by redesignating section 18 as section 19, and by inserting immediately after section 17 the following new section:

"SEC. 18. The Director is authorized to expend such sums, within the limits of 10 percent of appropriated funds, as the Director may deem desirable for awarding research contracts, grants, research fellowships, and enter into other forms of financial relationships with institutions of higher learning within the United States and their faculties and students. The selection of persons to receive such contracts, grants, fellowships, and assistance shall be made on the basis of ability and of the relevance of the proposed work to the mission and programs of the National Bureau of Standards.".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective October 1, 1985.

SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

SEC. 8. In order to maintain a highly qualified scientific staff at the National Bureau of Standards, a goal of 20 positions is established for the Senior Scientists Program at the National Bureau of Standards.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY, TECHNOLOGY, AND INNOVATION

SEC. 9. In addition to the sums authorized in the preceding provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1986 the sum of $2,777,000 for the activities of the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE

SEC. 10. (a) Section 2 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1152), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) To acquire capital equipment and inventories from receipts for work or services

performed or to be performed under this section.".

(b) In addition to the sums authorized in the preceding provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1986 the sum of $537,000 for the patent licensing activities of the National Technical Information Service.

AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 11. Appropriations made under the authority provided in this Act shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure for such periods as may be specified in the Acts making such appropriations.

COST REDUCTION REPORT

SEC. 12. Within 90 days of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Bureau of Standards shall review those recommendations of the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control and such other recommendations as may be included in the Office of Management and Budget report entitled "Management of the United States Government—1986", and shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the appropriate committees of the House and Senate on the implementation status of each such recommendation which affects the National Bureau of Standards and which is within the authority and control of the Director.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 6.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: At the end of section 6, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective for any fiscal year only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment corrects an error in the bill brought to our attention by the Committee on the Budget of the House and does not affect, as I understand it, the outlays under the bill. The amendment is technical in that sense.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, we have the same understanding. We have no quarrel with that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 10, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: in section 10, strike "(a)" and all that follows through "(b)".

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, this subsection was requested by the administration to clarify the authority of the National Technical Information Service to purchase equipment and inventories from receipts for work performed or services performed by the NTIS. Pursuant to our committee's agreement with Mr. DINGELL, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who expressed reservations about this section, we are offering an amendment for its deletion.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, we have had occasion to examine the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substantive amendment to section 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: In section 2(a)(1) strike "39,985,000" and insert "$36,607,000",

In section 2(a)(2) strike "$23,184,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,943,000",

In section 2(a)(3) strike "$34,846,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$33,555,000",

In section 2(a)(4) strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,393,000",

In section 2(a)(6) strike "$8,745,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,481,000",

In section 2(a)(7) strike "$9,368,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,179,000",

Strike section 2(a)(8),

In section 2(b)(3) strike "$5,608,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,405,000", and

Strike section 2(b)(4).

In section 3 strike "$600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$508,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is the freeze amendment. This amendment would reduce the totals throughout the bill in various line items so that the bottom line matches the appropriations for the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1985.

□ 1310

It brings the bottom line to $127.8 billion. It represents a total reduction in various functions throughout the amendment of a total of $15,970,000.

I have to say that, from my point of view, I view these efforts we make through the National Bureau of Standards as an investment; I think that they should be considered in that light rather than pure expense, as such, but I do recognize that we are all reaching for some kind of principle that we can get broad enough support on the floor of the House of Representatives so that we can bring real restraint to Government budgets in this year.

I think it is fair to say that the freeze amendment, as developed by both Mr. MORRISON and Mr. PURSELL, and others who have worked in that area, does represent that kind of broad consensus that can get the necessary political support.

In that sense, it can be recommended. It is not without loss that we make these reductions. We would be eliminating all inflationary adjustments in the NBS; a pattern that we should remember has been largely true over the last decade or so that has resulted in essentially flat budgets for this Agency on an effective purchasing power level over these 10 years.

We would be reducing the initiatives that the President called for. We would be delaying at least, and certainly not now providing for the construction of the cold neutron source facility.

There is a certain sense that this cut could be made because the building has not yet started construction. But at the same time we all ought to realize that any delay in bringing this facility to reality is something that will prevent us from making future progress in materials at least as fast as we could make them, and perhaps as our economy would need them.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALGREN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to first state my support and appreciation for the committee coming forward with this freeze amendment.

In doing so, it vindicates two points; both of which are equally important. It first recognizes the movement forward that we have made over the last few weeks in the House to restrain Federal spending, to say that a very wise place to start in the process of dealing with the budget deficit is to say that at last year's spending level, or the 1985 spending level, the level that we are at now, is one that we have reached an agreement on and that we can use as a consensus.

Beyond that, by the committee offering this amendment, it is setting the priorities, the choices. That is not something that should be done on the

floor of the House for a random reason or which should be left solely to the agency. The correct balance between congressional oversight and the priorities of the agencies is established when the authorizing committee comes in and makes the choices about where we should be concentrating our resources.

So in that sense this amendment does exactly what needs to be done. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct when he says there is going to be some loss involved in this. There is going to be some loss in dealing with the Federal budget deficit.

It is wrong to suggest, as some would from time to time, that we can deal with this budget deficit crisis with all fat and no meat, without hardship to anyone. The fact is that there is going to be hardship; we have allowed ourselves to get into a very dangerous situation overall, and we are going to have to make tough choices to reclaim a reasonable Federal budget.

It is unfortunate that sharing in this must be those agencies which are focused on the future. But the future as a whole will be denied if we do not deal with the Federal budget deficit, and that has to be a priority.

But let me also say that we should not go to excess. There may be an amendment to reduce the authorization levels in the bill below the freeze level, below a level that we agreed last year was needed for this Agency.

(On request of Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALGREN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALGREN. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut, and then would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I would oppose such an amendment. It would be a mistake to decide to move in the direction of the President's budget, which proposes a lower level of funding for NBS, rather than the consensus level which is a result of the House and the Senate and the President's agreement last year. That is the position that ought to prevail, and I am pleased that that is the position the committee has come to, not because it prefers it, but because it realizes the balance that must be struck.

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for those thoughts.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I ask for this time to ask a question of the gentleman from Connecticut.

Yesterday we had the discussion about what we ought to do, whether to freeze everything at the 1985 level or the request level. Is the gentleman telling me now that he is prepared to vote for an increase of $4 million over what the Agency requested? Was that what I gathered from your remarks?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would yield.

Mr. WALGREN. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I am prepared to vote for the 1985 appropriation level. The level that the House and the Senate and the President agreed upon last year for the current year of operations. That is a consensus position; it is not the House position, it is not the Senate position; it is not the President's position. It is the product of debate and compromise and consideration.

I think that level is preferable to the level recommended by the President and even more preferable than the level which I understand may be offered as an amendment later today and which would cut the authorization below the level recommended by the administration.

I oppose that. It is not the right direction for us to take. If our committee had come to us saying that they agreed that this amount could be saved, if that was their recommendation, I would be happy to support it.

But our committee has said not only that the freeze level is appropriate, but that we should be spending significantly more. That is their initial position.

So it is up to the committees to come forward to us with their views on what the Agency itself says is an appropriate level for 1986.

Mr. LUJAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I might tell the gentleman that that is not a unanimous position of the entire committee, that we funded at $127 million. There are some of us that believe that there are some items in there that could very well stand scrutiny, and that we could very well go to save an additional $4 million for the purpose of balancing the budget.

So that during the debate you will notice that there are a number of us who have some specific reasons in addition to balancing the budget, for wanting to reduce it to the request level of the Agency.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. If the gentleman would yield for one moment more, I think that there is always room for debate about particular line items, but I think if what the gentleman is advocating is further specific savings based on the merits of that particular proposal, then we ought to adopt the freeze amendment, and you ought to make your arguments specifically on the merits and not confuse the issue as to whether we are pursuing here a strategy toward dealing with the deficit which cuts across many authorizations, or a specific debate about a particular priority the committee has chosen.

Mr. WALGREN. I yield initially to the gentleman from Michigan, who has been on his feet.

Mr. PURSELL. I would like to address the House for 5 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. WALGREN. Then I would yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, but I do so reluctantly.

The gentleman offers a very thoughtful proposal for freezing the NBS at the 1985 appropriated level. He does so, it seems, in the least painful manner by preserving the current programs at the bureau including the center for fire research, center for building technology and the vast majority.

He seeks to maintain the in-house capabilities of the bureau which we have stated previously is, in itself, a national laboratory for standardization of weights and measurements. This amendment would allow the biotechnology, ceramics, and process and quality control new initiatives to go forward at somewhat reduced schedules, however, it would not authorize new construction of the cold neutron facility. The cold neutron program proposed by the administration is $8 million. The committee is very supportive of this initiative.

As a matter of fact, the President's Science Adviser tells me that it is the only major scientific construction initiative in this budget.

Certainly, this is reflected in the committee report, it concerns me that in this "freeze" mode, exciting initiatives such as this are pushed to the side.

I would urge the committee and the full House to look favorably on possible alternative means of providing for this construction project.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment offered. In a freeze mode, this amendment, is by far, the more sound with respect to scientific and technological mandated programs at NBS.

□ 1320

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise to speak in favor of the amendment.

First of all, I want to salute and congratulate the bipartisan effort on behalf of the Republican and Democratic leadership of the committee. We have turned the corner, I think, after the historic early vote on NASA in which we had a significant, overwhelming majority vote in favor of reducing the authorization of expenditures for 1986 back to the 1985 level. That was 2 weeks ago. Yesterday we had another significant, overwhelming

majority vote in favor of accomplishing that same goal, achieving a freeze on fiscal year 1986 authorization at the fiscal year 1985 appropriated levels for the National Science Foundation. That was yesterday. Today we are looking at the third bill. So on behalf of many in the House, we feel very confident that this amendment, introduced by the committee following my and the gentleman from Connecticut's [Mr. MORRISON] declaration of intent to introduce a similar amendment, will achieve the third step in that movement toward addressing the fiscal deficit of this Nation—now well over $200 billion.

This amendment will bring down 1986 authorizations for NBS to the 1985 current budget levels. So I believe, with both Republicans and Democrats trying to reach a balanced budget as soon as possible, that this is probably the best compromise that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] and myself, and others, now with the committee support on both sides can accept. As I understand it, the majority of the committee members on both sides—I cannot speak for all of them—really feel confident that we are achieving a major, significant breakthrough in the fight for a balanced budget.

Now it has been true during the years that I have been here, now over 8 years, and during my years as a member of the Appropriations Committee, now over 6 years, that we have developed battles between the Democrats and Republicans on national priorities. We will continually have that, as it should be. But I think this is significant, historically, that we are changing with the mood of the public and the American taxpayers to balance the budget. It is quite clear to me that it is time we move above partisan politics and develop good public policy in trying to achieve some compromise to reach that lower level, namely, a balanced budget ultimately and I hope, as soon as possible.

This is round three. We won round one. Round two has been completed and won. This is round three.

I think the administration would like fewer dollars for the National Bureau of Standards. I think the difference in the administration's figure and the fiscal year 1985 appropriated level is only about $4 million. So I understand there is a difference in principle. We may fight that out subsequently this afternoon on another amendment. And that is the way it should be. But, frankly, I am very supportive of the committee amendment. It is a step in the right direction. The trend in Congress is changing and, quite frankly, I think the administration would accept this freeze amendment and sign this bill. I cannot speak for the administration, I do not have anything in writing, I am not sure anybody else does. But as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure in achieving that trend in turning the country around toward a balanced budget goal ultimately, and in bringing down the interest rates and improving our economy, I really, frankly, believe that the administration would sign this bill if it were at the freeze level.

We will discuss it and debate it and probably have two votes here this afternoon—one on the freeze, and one on dropping below the freeze to the President's request. I would recommend very strongly that the House on both sides of the aisle adopt the committee amendment, the freeze, which I fully support and have participated in developing along with the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan. I have been very pleased in the way our cooperation together has been reflected by a bipartisan coalition throughout the House. The gentleman from Michigan was prepared to offer this freeze amendment but because of procedural reasons it is being offered by the committee, and in many ways that it is even superior because it shows an acknowledgement by the committee of trying to meet the standard that the House has begun to set on these matters in terms of overall spending levels.

I want to commend the gentleman on this leadership and I hope that we will continue to move on beyond round three, to later rounds, to deal with the Federal deficit in a realistic way.

Mr. PURSELL. I think, in my closing remarks here, that it is important to emphasize that the personalities and who gets credit for what amendment is irrelevant. This issue is so deep and so difficult and so dramatic and traumatic in respect to what we are doing with the deficit. However, you have not seen anything yet if you compare what we are doing in compared to the out years of 1987 and 1988. My God, a freeze will do nothing to any extent to really get to that balanced budget. Some day we are going to have to look at a serious reduction across the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALGREN and by unanimous consent, Mr. PURSELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. WALGREN. I just wanted to say, on behalf of many members of the committee, that we certainly appreciate the spirit in which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] have joined in this effort, and particularly that the gentleman from Michigan has supported the distribution of the cuts which we can fashion from our committee's perspective. I would like to recommend the distribution of those cuts to the rest of the body as being very responsible. We cut a total of $15 million, $5 million from current programs and $10 million from new initiatives. It is balanced through there quite delicately with the hope of preserving as much value as we possibly can.

We do not take the position that you cannot cut this bill further. The gentleman from New Mexico said, clearly, you could cut some budgets almost anywhere. And that is true. But we do feel there is a place for rescissions in our process, that these are the responsible levels to give to the programmatic areas, then there is another chance for the administration to come back to us requesting rescissions if there are some particular items, as the gentleman from New Mexico suggested, that could be taken down further. This is not the end of the process but this is the responsible place for the House.

Mr. PURSELL. I concur with the chairman. I did not, in initially offering the amendment, want to preempt the priorities of the jurisdiction of the committee; namely, Science and Technology. I served on this great committee at one time. I have a great respect for the leadership, the members and the staff of the committee. They are appropriately set to develop public policy by reprogramming within the freeze levels, and I congratulate the committee for taking that leadership here today, and I again hope that we adopt the amendment as offered.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALGREN

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER to the amendment offered by Mr. WALGREN: Strike the amount "$36,607,000," and everything that follows, and insert in lieu thereof "$38,607,000";

In section 2(a)(2) strike "$23,184,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$22,443,000";

In section 2(a)(3) strike "$34,846,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$33,555,000";

In section 2(a)(4) strike "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$9,393,000";

In section 2(a)(6) strike "$8,745,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,481,000";

In section 2(a)(7) strike "$9,368,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,697,000";

Strike section 2(a)(8);

In section 2(b)(3) strike "$5,608,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,405,000"; and

Strike section 2(b)(4).

Strike section 3 and renumber accordingly.

In section 9 (page 10, line 13) strike "$2,777,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,991,000".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think with certainty that there is a tide running through the Congress, which I applaud, and I certainly want to applaud the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and others, who have spoken out on the freeze amendment here, because I think we are finally on the verge of actually putting the reins on some of the runaway spending and taking control of some of our deficit problems with some of the things we have done on the floor in the last couple of weeks.

In recent days we have shown a willingness to cut the budget requests back to the fiscal year 1985 freeze level for both the NASA authorization and the National Science Foundation. While both of these programs are extremely important to our Nation, I am glad that the membership of this House was willing to make the tough policy decisions to start to address overall our budget problems.

Today we ought to make some similar decisions concerning the National Bureau of Standards. The President submitted a budget this year for the Bureau which calls for a reduction from last year of less than $4 million from a total budget of $123.9 million. Also included in this bill are the activities of the Office of Productivity, Technology, and Innovation and the National Technical Information Service of the Department of Commerce. That adds a little bit more money in this overall picture. However, the administration, it should be realized, has come forward with a budget request that indicates that they can carry out all of the activities for $5.278 million less than last year. Remember what we are talking about here. We are talking about the people who have the responsibility for running these programs. They say that they can run all of these programs for a figure of $5.278 million less than they spent last year.

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

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

□ 1330

Mr. WALGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Unless I misunderstand, I thought the administration was saying we could run it for $5.27 million less if you eliminated the Center for Fire Research, and if you eliminated the Building Technology Center.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will allow me to go on with my remarks, the gentleman will find out that in my amendment I have preserved those options, so that, in fact, I come down to the committee's priorities. What I am saying is that the administration says that they can run this agency for this amount of money. I do not necessarily buy their priorities, and if the gentleman will allow me here, I will point out that in the amendment that we are offering, we preserve those priorities of the committee, but come in at a spending level which is at the administration's request level.

As I said just a minute ago, I agree that some of the proposals made by the administration did not conform to the priorities of the Committee on Science and Technology. There are several programs which we on the committee felt strongly should be continued. One excellent example of that is the Center the Fire Research, which the administration has totally zeroed out and which the committee restored. In this amendment, that particular commitment on the part of the committee remains; the Center for Fire Research remains in the Walker amendment.

My amendment would hold the bill to the administration request, but not the specific administration numbers. If there ever was a case of having the opportunity to give the people who actually run executive bureaus the opportunity to show us that they can run their program effectively with the amount of money that they have requested, here is the perfect opportunity.

The Director of the National Bureau of Standards came before the committee and testified that he fully supported that figure in the President's budget request. I think that we should, and in fact, we must, give him and them the opportunity to show us that they can live within that budget.

Both Chairman WALGREN and I would change the numbers on various line items, and in general, our numbers are closely in agreement. However, I would hold their feet to the fire just a bit more closely and require them to accomplish their missions at the budget level.

There has been a lot of talk on the floor of the House about a freeze at the 1985 level. In some programs, that may make sense, because what we are doing is reducing, in order to do something about the deficit, we are reducing from proposals that the administration has put forward that would increase spending in 1986.

In others, however, such as programs contained in this bill, it makes no sense that we should be bound today by the funding priorities of yesterday, because in this case what the freeze does is say that the administration's attempt to lower our spending should not be complied with; that we ought to indeed raise spending to the freeze level.

Well, I do not think we ought to be raising spending to the freeze level; I think what we ought to be doing is lowering spending to the requested level. That is what my amendment would do.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, on the flip side of that coin the administration is asking for increases in foreign aid. Are you supporting increases over 1985, above the freeze, for additional money for foreign aid, because the administration is making that request?

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentleman that that is the issue that we had here on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURSELL. I would say to the gentleman would he support the freeze level on foreign aid?

Mr. WALKER. Yes; I certainly would. As a matter of fact, I would support cutting foreign aid.

Mr. PURSELL. So then, in effect, you are not in favor of the administration's additional increase in foreign aid?

Mr. WALKER. That is the point. Let me say to the gentleman that that is the question I thought we settled out here in the past week, where the administration has come in with requests above the 1985 levels, as they did with NASA, as they did with NSF, we made a determination on this floor that we would cut back to the 1985 level. I would say that we ought to at least do that much with foreign aid.

However, this is a little question that we have got before us. In this case, in order to get a freeze level, you have to raise the spending above the administration's request. The administration here is lower than what the 1985 spending level was. What I am suggesting is if we really want to do something about the deficit, what we

ought to be doing is taking the lower of the two figures. Either the freeze level, when that is lower, or the administration's level, when that is lower. That will really begin to get us a handle on deficits, because at that point then you begin to cut back from the 1985 deficit level.

You know, the 1985 deficits were not exactly a bed of roses. I mean, we had plenty of deficits in this fiscal year. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars worth of deficits right now. So it seems to me that maybe what we ought to do is be doing a freeze plus. As a matter of fact, I heard the gentleman from Connecticut say here a few minutes ago that the freeze was a good place to start, and I agree with him. It is a place to start. But ought we not be doing more? We ought not just start there, we ought to move beyond that. Good heavens, if you cannot cut $5 million out of the National Bureau of Standards to get down to below the freeze, where can you cut? Is there any place we can cut below the freeze level if we cannot do it in the National Bureau of Standards? I cannot imagine that there is very much that we can do if we cannot go below this by $5 million.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman.

Many of us have worked to try to establish a bipartisan support to achieve a $50 billion-plus. A freeze will only get us about $38 billion.

Mr. WALKER. I agree.

Mr. PURSELL. I think everyone in the House is looking for $12 to $15 billion more in the 1986 budget, so I do not think the gentleman suggests that the Members here are just looking purely at a simple freeze.

We are not, and I have not heard of any Member, including Chairman BILL GRAY, who said last night, he is looking for additional money to achieve a $50 to a $53 billion figure. So I am suggesting that we ought to be very careful and try to establish a principle here that historically could be successful in a bipartisan effort, rather than trying to play, and I am not going to accuse the gentleman from Pennsylvania of playing games, because it is what the administration wants. The fact is that we are writing a new budget. The Reagan budget is dead on arrival; it was dead 2 months. The Senate is writing a new budget. Over in the Senate.

Now, you have not referred to what the Senate is doing.

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentleman that it is against the rules of the House to refer to what the Senate is doing.

Mr. PURSELL. We may not agree with the Senate budget, so we, in preserving the integrity of the House, are asking for a compromise here to write a House budget for the American people. That will achieve a $50 billion-plus goal for 1986, which is exactly what the President is asking Congress to do. It is not a question of the goal, it is a question of how do we accomplish that. The principle here of the budget freeze will establish that plus additional costs.

I think the gentleman and I are in agreement on the additional cuts; the question is where and how, and this is not the time to do that.

Mr. WALKER. That is the point that I am making with the gentleman; that here we have a chance to get $5 million of that additional $12 billion you say we need. We are going to get a measly $5 million of the $12 billion that you have just said that we need.

Now, if we cannot take $5 million out of the National Bureau of Standards, where in the world are we going to be able to cut? What programs are we going to cut it out of if we cannot get it here? We are talking about only $5 million, and we are talking about $5 million which the people who run these programs say that they can get along without. Now, if we cannot do that, I would suggest that it is not really in the best spirit of a debate to suggest that we are going to do more at some point in the future. That is the problem; where are we going to do more?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would point out to the gentleman that we have achieved something unique here this week, in this body, with bipartisan cooperation to get at what we all want to get at, and the gentleman in the well has been a leader in it, and that is the deficit facing the American people.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WALKER was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. WALKER. I continue to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOEHLERT. But when you point out, and you are very eloquent and you do so very well in the well of the House, but let me point out we are only talking about $5 million. Let us look at some of these figures. The Bureau of Standards asked for $226 million. Then the Department of Commerce asked for $146 million. The committee came, well, 40 percent below the Bureau's request. We came below the Department's request, and now we are lopping off an additional $12 billion.

When you give blood a pint here a pint there is OK, but you cannot give 15 quarts.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman and, of course, every bureaucracy comes in with all kinds of big requests. You know, the bureaucrats have all kinds of things they can spend money on. Our point here is to set priorities. The only point that I am making is that here we come to that key decision; a precedent-setting decision as to whether or not we are simply going to have the freeze, which gets us $38 billion, as the gentleman from Michigan has told us, or whether or not we are going to get more than the freeze.

If you are going to get more, I would suggest that here is the place you are going to have to start. This is the first time you have had a chance to focus on whether or not you are going to increase spending as a result of freezing. You see, it is easy for some of our folks here to say that we are going to decrease the administration's request by freezing because they do not agree with the administration's priorities. I wonder now what is going to happen when they start increasing spending by freezing. Because the effect of what they will do unless they support my amendment is the fact that they will spend, they will bust the President's budget by $5 million by freezing.

□ 1340

I am suggesting we ought not to be busting the President's budget on the National Bureau of Standards; that we ought to try to do what we can to bring the level down to the President's budget and make certain that we accept the lower of the two figures if we are really going to fight deficits.

I thought that was what this freeze movement was all about, really fighting deficits.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have come to have a great deal of respect for the gentleman's eloquence and consistency, and I think there would be considerable merit in the position that he takes, particularly from the standpoint of his own philosophy, but look at the position that it puts me in.

In effect, the gentleman is saying that I have to take either this year's President's priorities or last year's President's priorities, and I do not agree with either one of them. So I am in the position of having to reject that course, although I, too, am seeking the same goal of deficit reduction. I would like to get that $50 billion-plus reduc-

tion, but I have to be consistent with my own priorities for what is good for the country, rather than to allow a President with whom I vigorously disagree set those priorities for me.

Mr. WALKER. I agree with the gentleman, but I would say to him that then he probably has problems with the whole freeze idea, too, because what we are doing there is locking in priorities at a 1985 level kind of regardless of whether or not those were the right priorities.

I understand where the gentleman comes from on that issue and that he must have problems under the freeze. All I am saying in this instance is if we are focusing on deficit numbers that it makes some sense to take the lower figure, whichever that lower figure is, whether it be the President's figures or whether it be the freeze figure, and we have decided to take the lower figure, on the freeze when it was lower than the President's request. Now we have a chance to take the President's figure when that is the lower figure.

That is the opportunity I am offering to the House. We do so by maintaining the committee's set priorities, and I would hope the House would decide not to bust the President's budget but, rather, save us money and help in real deficit reduction.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and in support of the amendment offered by the committee.

It appears that my friend from Pennsylvania is trying to have his cake and eat it, too, and at the same time he has a little arsenic in the dessert.

As I understand the amendment, and the gentleman can correct me if I am in error, in the area of a biotechnology initiative, the committee reduced by $2 million, and the gentleman is restoring that $2 million back into that area.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. FUQUA. That is my understanding. What we have here is a new program, new initiatives, which will require in 1987 and 1988 and 1989 moneys to support those programs at this level.

What does concern me is down in the area of central technical support where the administration requested $9,368,000, the committee has reduced that about $1.2 million to $8,179,000, and as I understand the gentleman's amendment, he reduces that by $6,482,000, leaving there $1,697,000 in the budget. That is still $7,671,000 below the administration's request.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield; yes, the gentleman is correct, and the reason why that was done was because in discussions this morning with the Under Secretary of Commerce, a former member of this body, I was assured that what we have is a $12 million carryover in that area and that, in fact, they can maintain their programs at the levels that I am seeking in this particular portion of my amendment by utilizing that carryover.

I thank the gentleman and he is correct in the point that he makes.

Mr. FUQUA. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I am informed that the $12 million does not exist and I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WALGREN), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WALGREN. Things are happening relatively quickly here on the floor, and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, he was informed just this morning, and we did not have this amendment until about 10 minutes ago. It strikes me as not the best way to structure the budget of the Bureau of Standards.

We talked to the Bureau yesterday with respect to the working capital fund and it is our information that every dime of the working capital fund that the gentleman says is there to be carried over to be used for some of these essential functions is committed to a purchase of equipment or a commitment this year. So there is not one penny there that can be put to this other use.

I would only like to say that this is a national laboratory that we are trying to preserve. If we do not have the equipment there at the right time for the right mind, the mind goes someplace else or does something else, so the working capital fund is the last point where you would want to disrupt a national laboratory.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, I would simply point out that it is the Under Secretary who has the responsibility for administering the programs of the agency. The Under Secretary obviously would be very concerned, I would think, about stripping bare one of the main operating accounts if, in fact, he did not have that kind of money. It is his personal representation that this is, in fact, the situation and that we can get that kind of money out of that particular category because of the $12 million carryover.

Mr. FUQUA. I appreciate that and, of course, the Under Secretary is a good friend of mine and we served in this House together and on another committee together, and I wish he would visit the NBS more often if he has visited it, because I think it would be very enlightening, and also the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

But one of the problems we have is that the money is committed. For instance, right today, starting this month, they are in the process of installing a class 6 supercomputer that will be in the process of being installed and be ready to operate in fiscal year 1986, which begins in October.

What we are doing by this amendment, they will not have any money to operate that computer system. There are also several other things. There is some important maintenance on the laboratory where we have millions of dollars worth of equipment. There are two roofs that are in serious need of repair and that money is being removed, and those are set for repair in fiscal year 1986.

We have replacement for boiler refractory brick that must take place in order to keep that operating correctly, and also some electrical power distribution replacement. As we move along and have more energy requirements, particularly electrical energy requirements, they must be upgraded, and these are very critical things. So that the laboratory can operate in an efficient manner.

I do not think we in this Congress want to add additional money for ceramics and biotechnology and at the same time turn around and say, "Well, we are sorry but you do not have any money to keep the lights on and keep the place operating, and your supercomputer that you have paid a considerable amount of money for, the taxpayers of this country, we are sorry but there will not be any money to operate this."

This is the difference between the two amendments. We can philosophize all we want to about a freeze. Unfortunately, this agency has been treated for many years, not under this administration but other administrations of my own party, like a stepchild, and one that was not very welcome.

□ 1350

I would hope that my friend, the Under Secretary would visit the NBS and learn more about that because it certainly does not get very high attention in the hierarchy of the dining halls of the Department of Commerce, and it would be a great help if he would do that and better understand it.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman is saying. Maybe if the food was a little better, we might see the Under Secretary there. No, I am not really at all

familiar with the food at the National Bureau of Standards.

I would like to point out, in support of what the gentleman in the well is saying, that if you look at the National Bureau of Standards as a model Federal laboratory working collaboratively with industry, you see a kind of a gem out there in the Federal R&D establishment that probably should be rewarded. Over the past 5 or 6 years, there has been essentially, in real dollars, about a 25-percent cut. Now, the administration's policy to support science and technology is clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] has expired.

(On request of Mr. RITTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I am hpapy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, this science and technology budget is essentially flat adjusted for inflation. It is essentially frozen. It makes no sense to take this agency, which is perhaps doing its job better than some of the other agencies within the Federal R&D establishment, and cut it. It makes no sense, as we find ourselves in a race for our technological lives, to pull the rug out from under one of the best performers that we have.

It seems to me that a freeze is enough, that if we have a policy of freezing science and technology overall within the administration's budget and allowing for inflation, and we are not even allowing for inflation in this budget, a freeze is enough.

There are a number of things that persons like myself would like to see done at the National Bureau of Standards, but I am willing to forgo them in accepting a freeze. So I do not think a cut at this stage is the right way to go.

I would like to point out that I am not sure about this $12 million. I would hope that while the jury is out and while we try to get this number firmed up, Members do not make a decision on this. This is something that is coming to certain Members this morning, and I just do not have the right kind of information.

Let me say this: Everybody has his or her story as to how certain agencies dump money out before the end of a fiscal year deadline simply to get it spent so that they will not lose it in the upcoming year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. RITTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if you really want to plan a program and you want to make your investments flow naturally, you do not just throw the money out the door at the end of the fiscal year deadline. You can plan for it. And my view at this point, not knowing the full details of the circumstances, is that there is probably some good reason why these funds were planned to be spent this time around, as opposed to getting rid of them before the deadline.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

It is my understanding that while there may be $12 million there, those moneys have been committed during the course of this fiscal year, and by going back and removing those, we are doing a very serious injustice to a very fine agency of this Federal Government, and a lot of fine and dedicated scientists and personnel that make it work.

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Although I no longer serve on the committee, last year I had the opportunity to offer the amendment which basically froze the agency's levels into the prior-year levels, so the proposal of the gentleman from Florida and the committee proposal would basically be a 2-year freeze of the agency, as I understand it, which is a fairly significant retarding of spending and represents, in my opinion, a very appropriate level.

The Walker amendment, as it is proposed, presumes that the initial administration budget as sent up was a respectable budget, and I have to admit that when I was the ranking member on this committee, I was a little discouraged with the approach that OMB took in sending its budget up, because essentially they took the classic approach that you ran into if you happened to be on the school board and you asked your superintendent of schools to make a cut in your school department. OMB cut out or eliminated two major programs of the Bureau of Standards, knowing full well that those programs were going to have to go back in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FUQUA] has expired.

(On request of Mr. GREGG, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FUQUA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it was as if on a school board budget, the superintendent had come in and cut out the football team, the baseball team, and the school bus, and then added new initiatives, knowing full well that they were going to leave it up to the school board to put back in the football team, the baseball team, and the school bus and then deal with the new initiatives. That is exactly what the OMB has done here.

They eliminated the Fire Program, which is the core program in the Bureau of Standards. It is the program that develops the standards by which it is determined whether or not fabrics are flammable. It is the type of standards that are universally accepted so that children can wear fabrics which do not ignite if they are playing with fire and so if people fall asleep smoking on their couch, their couch will not burn them to death and burn the house with them. That program is a core program. But OMB zeroed it out.

There was also the construction program which they zeroed out, the Buildings Institute, which is a core program that dealt with the structural aspects of buildings such as what we are concerned with in the Kansas City case, and they know those programs are going to come back in.

Thus they put the committee between a rock and a hard place, essentially saying to the committee, "All right, we have zeroed out these programs, but we have added $16 million of new initiatives. Now you have to figure out how you are going to handle it, but we have given you a reasonable budget that is under the freeze level."

That is intellectually dishonest, and in my opinion, a freeze of this agency, which would be a 2-year carryforward freeze, is a fair level of funding. And I do not think anybody in this House can accuse me of being a spendthrift. In fact, I think I probably rank as one of the more conservative Members on the issue of spending.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly will support a freeze level, but for me to support the proposal of the administration, I think, would be to support a funding level which is unjust and done with mirrors.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, as has been outlined very clearly, that the agency has been frozen. It is in a retrenched position. To adopt the Walker amendment over the committee amendment even further punishes the agency. The agency does not deserve that, and the American people do not deserve that. I urge the Members to vote for the committee amendment and against the Walker amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the discussion here today about cutting back the National Bureau of Standards is a painful dis-

cussion to a lot of us. I would have just as soon last week left the funding as the committee brought it in for NASA. I would have been perfectly happy yesterday to have had the funding remain as the committee brought it in for the National Science Foundation, and because I do support the National Bureau of Standards, the $143 million under normal circumstances would have been something that I would have enjoyed supporting.

But we are faced with a different sort of decision here today. The gentleman from Michigan a little while ago was saying that the group they have was looking for $50 billion in reductions, but they can only find $38 billion if they freeze everything—being short some $12 billion. Well, here is $5 million of that $12 billion. So we have to look at that lowest figure.

I am afraid that today we are setting a precedent for how we conduct the authorizing of other agencies. We are setting a precedent that it will be at the freeze level if we accept the first amendment that was offered.

Let me say that I support both amendments. From my point of view, we cannot lose whichever one happens to win. But if we are going to look at only freezing at the 1985 level, we are going to be short on spending by $50 billion in this country.

Now, there is a rationale for the cuts. We had in committee some discussions about an item in there for overhead. There was $4.8 million in there for overhead, for such things as travel, public relations, increases in salary, and advertising—and those kinds of things can be reduced.

□ 1400

Consultant fees were in that $4.8 million. Coming on to the floor, we had cut that by $1.2 million by agreement in the committee, but that still left the $3.6 million in this committee bill today.

I think it is reasonable to be able to say that if you cannot cut the overhead, where are you going to cut?

One of the things in the report says that we will take the Director from a level 4 to a level 3. Let me tell you that I have the highest regard for the Director of the National Bureau of Standards. I think he ought to be paid a lot more than he is being paid, but under the circumstances, under the budget constraints that we have, perhaps this is not a good time to do it.

So I would support first the Walker amendment which takes it down to $122 million and then the Walgren amendment which takes it to $127 million. I will not be unhappy with either one of those amendments that happen to make it, but I think I have a suspicious mind in this particular instance. I do not know why it keeps reoccurring to me that there has been an examination of the budget and that by freezing some favorite programs at 1985 would be higher than recommended by the administration and so we are looking for an increase from the recommendation by using the word "freeze."

I would be much more comfortable in all our authorizations to have it either at the freeze level or at the requested level, whichever is lowest.

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

Mr. LUJAN. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make one point. Some of the people who have been opposing my amendment have opposed it on the grounds that somehow we are launching a vicious assault on the agency. I want to assure the gentleman and those others that that is not the intent. What we are trying to do is launch a vicious assault on the deficit. I think it is maybe something that we ought to do, but I certainly believe the NBS is a valuable, useful agency. It is just that we have some tough decisions to make, as the gentleman has said, and I appreciated the gentleman's support.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very welcome set of votes that we are going to be having here in the House in a few minutes with respect to these two amendments. The gentleman from New Mexico and I discussed this issue yesterday and I think it is properly a question that will send a signal to the Budget Committee as to what the thinking of the House is, so I think it is a good situation to have.

I very much support, as I said earlier, the freeze proposal coming from the gentleman from Pennsylvania on behalf of the committee and I oppose the further cut that is recommended in the amendment from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Now, let us look at what we are actually doing here. We are going to be voting, not on the validity of the Bureau of Standards or its budget; obviously, if we were voting on just that program and nothing else, probably the committee's recommendation of $144 million would receive support in the House, because the committee has made a considered judgment far below some of the requests that have come out of the administration for the specifics and it has come to us with a reasonable budget; but we are debating here an overall budget policy and how that is going to be implemented.

Now, the freeze is one way to go. The gentleman from New Mexico questions whether this is some kind of stalking horse in order to spend a lot more money on some other program. That is not the case.

The Budget Committee can come to us with further reductions even in the National Bureau of Standards after we pass this authorization. This is the first step. This is the authorization. We are establishing the maximum, not the minimum amount that can be spent. Therefore, if the Budget Committee determines in reaching that $50 billion or more in spending cuts, this is where to get $5 million, they will be in a position to do that. I doubt this is where they will find the $5 million. I doubt that is the case and I do not think the House should find it for them there right now.

We are at the first stage of the budget process. We are establishing a principle. The principle is that until money is available to pay for it, if ever, we should not spend more in 1986 than we will spend in 1985. That is not the whole solution to the deficit, but if you do not start there, how will we ever tame it?

We have plenty of opportunity to find more money to be saved; but the one thing we ought not to do is blindly accept the administration's budget as the guide to where the money ought to be saved. The administration's budget is a disaster in many other places, not only in the Bureau of Standards. The administration's budget is shortsighted. It is unwise. It does not reflect the priorities that this House ought to adopt.

We have a choice. The choice is clear. Shall we freeze or will we vote for the President's budget?

I think the President's budget is ill-advised in this area and a freeze is a sensible position.

I urge a "no" vote on the Walker amendment and a "yes" vote on the Walgren amendment.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman for the leadership that he has provided in bringing this House to some degree of fiscal restraint in these times when we are so addicted to public debt and foreign capital to finance that debt, but I join him in urging my colleagues in this House to vote against the Walker amendment and to support a freeze, not more than a freeze, as is being proposed under that amendment.

I just would like to additionally point out that if you support this amendment, you are not cutting out fat. You are cutting into the very muscle and fiber of our efforts at high tech development in this country. Advanced ceramics and biotechnology suffer deep and severe cuts if this

amendment is accepted. These areas our competitors are investing much more money than we are. I just seems to me that it would be foolish to the ultimate degree and hurt our sustained economic prosperity if we are to make those kind of cuts now.

I think the gentleman for his leadership in fiscal discipline, but his restraint in showing that there comes a limit in the authorization process and you have to preserve the essence of this National Bureau of Standards program.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I just want to commend the gentleman for bringing before the House this key concern in all these determinations as to where we are going in the future.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted him to yield because I do want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from New York.

My spending in biotechnology and in ceramics and so on is precisely the same as the spending that is in the freeze amendment as proposed, so that in those areas there are no massive cuts. The spending is the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

(At the request of Mr. LUNDINE, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. This amendment gets changed so often that it is kind of hard to know the players without a scorecard.

Now what the gentleman is doing is taking it out of the Supercomputer Program, which as I understand it—where is he taking it?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Well, I have the time, and I would say from all I have heard, the gentleman is taking it out of the operations of the national laboratories, which sounds like a poor place to do it. The gentleman seems to be finding a mythical or a shadowy $12 million to pay for it and that does not sound like a good way for the Congress to proceed, but I will let the gentleman explain it.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What we are doing is taking the money out of an area where the Under Secretary of Commerce told us we have a $12 million surplus and where we can spend that $12 million in surplus in a way that will not impact upon these new starts; so in fact what we are doing is trying to get that surplus for the future.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me one more time?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUNDINE. I am going to have the opportunity next Tuesday with the Under Secretary of Commerce to go to Elmira, NY, where Westinghouse and Toshiba are building a new industrial operation of the highest technology. I will talk to the Under Secretary of Commerce about where this $12 million is; but the gentleman from Connecticut has made the essential point. If there is some kind of a surplus out there, the Budget Committee and the Appropriation Committees can find it. It is not presented to this authorizing committee and it would be indeed foolish at this point to cut this amount of money which could cut into very vital and essential functioning of the National Bureau of Standards.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his cooperation.

If I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] a while ago in relating to ceramics, the committee had taken $5 million out of that and now the gentleman has added it back in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1410

Mr. FUQUA. In addition, there has been $2 million put back in biotechnology initiative. These are fine initiatives and the committee supports these programs. But when you take the money out of the operating money there is not going to be any funds there to initiate the programs in the coming year. And the gentleman has put a ceiling on the amount of money that can be spent.

If there is money in the budget, even if the $12 million is still there, it cannot be spent because all they can spend under the gentleman's amendment is $1,697,000, a little over $1.5 million to operate. We are informed by the agency that that $12 million is already committed to carry out the funding for the remainder of this fiscal year. It may be unspent as of today but it is obligated because they still have another 6 months to go in this fiscal year.

So I am very concerned that we will have an agency, a fine agency and no gas.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken. Even if the money is not obligated or it will not be available for these purposes because of the legal effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1617, the National Bureau of Standards authorization bill for fiscal year 1986. Considering the huge budget deficits we have been having over the last several years, I want to congratulate Chairman FUQUA and the Committee on Science and Technology for doing an outstanding job under difficult circumstances. In my view, the National Bureau of Standards [NBS] has much to contribute to the well-being and the increased productivity of this Nation. In this regard, proper funding of its activities will ensure that NBS fulfills its mandated mission.

I also want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the strong support that the Science and Technology Committee has given to the Institute for Computer Science and Technology [ICST]. Public Law 89-306, which I authored, established for the first time a program to develop ADP and communications standards for the Federal Government. The Institute, which has administered this program for almost 20 years, has done a commendable job in developing standards that have greatly benefited the Government as well as the private sector.

More than 3 years ago, Joe Wright, then Deputy Secretary of the Department of Commerce, testified that the results of the Institute's work in the standards area was saving the Government about $132 million annually. Clearly, any program that is saving the Government more than $13 for every dollar spent is worth funding adequately and deserves the full support of Congress.

I support strongly Chairman FUQUA's amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] and I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and would ask all Members to support the Fuqua proposal.

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

I would say first of all to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] that I do not quite understand his point. There is nothing in my amendment which emasculates these programs. In fact, as the gentleman from Florida has just pointed out, I put some money back in in my amendment for new starts that in fact help us move toward trying to get some of these things done. And I think the gentleman from Florida would agree with me that the ceramics engine work is extremely important. It puts us in competition with the Japanese in the hopes of trying to get some technology where they will be able to compete.

So in that vein we are moving ahead with my amendment over and above what the committee wants to do.

I just want to make the point back to the gentleman from Florida with regard to the $12 million; as the gentleman knows, what I am doing is setting a level of appropriations or authorizations out of this year's funding level. But the $12 million of carryover money can certainly be spent without reference to this particular ceiling, so there is no problem on that.

In fact, we can move ahead and spend that money, and that is what the Under Secretary intends to do.

Mr. RITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I would just like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman to clarify what his amendment does with respect to the Office of Productivity and Technology Initiatives.

As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment keeps the administration figure at $1.8 million, down from $2.7 million, but does not provide for a phaseout in subsequent years and would then keep that program level?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is almost right. It is actually $1.9 million which is the present level of funding. I keep that, but instead of being a phaseout amount in my bill, it is, in fact, a retention amount in the bill. So the program would continue to go forward, but at the lesser amount that the administration originally requested.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman. I would like to point out that this program, this Office of Productivity and Technology Initiatives has been responsible for many of the private sector initiatives stimulating research and development in this country, like the R&D limited partnerships, like reducing antitrust barriers to research and development and like the R&D tax credits. It has been headed by Dr. Bruce Merrifield who has done a splendid job and in fact I am supporting in the Fuqua position keeping this office frozen at its current level.

Why cut something by one-third that has been doing a job with a minuscule amount of funding, that is doing a job for the industrial competitiveness of this country that we really need done.

I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, my comments are purely to put into context the overall discussion that we are having here on the issue of freeze to the previous year's spending levels or increase.

This is the third in a row of authorization bills that we have had. Today we are talking about a national laboratory for precision measurements. It is a part of our overall research and development, our production of science and technology.

Yesterday we had the bill that authorized the National Science Foundation, and 2 weeks ago we had the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In each of these situations we are taking the committee recommended level lower, back to the present year's spending level. And I think that we have to remind ourselves that if this is going to be a pattern that will replicate itself throughout the budgetary process then that is well and good because the Nation will be the better off for it.

However, if in the process of this budgetary system it starts to unravel, and certain agencies of Government have whopping increases and others have cuts, then it is incumbent upon us, particularly those of us Members that are here on this floor right now who understand the future of this country is involved with its production of science and technology, for us to come back and to raise that level to the committee recommended level.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Addabbo	Dixon	Johnson
Akaka	Donnelly	Jones (OK)
Alexander	Dornan (CA)	Jones (TN)
Anderson	Dowdy	Kanjorski
Andrews	Downey	Kaptur
Annunzio	Dreier	Kasich
Anthony	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Applegate	Durbin	Kemp
Archer	Dwyer	Kennelly
Armey	Dymally	Kildee
Aspin	Dyson	Kindness
Atkins	Eckart (OH)	Kleczka
AuCoin	Eckert (NY)	Kolbe
Badham	Edgar	Kolter
Barnard	Edwards (CA)	Kostmayer
Barnes	Edwards (OK)	Kramer
Bartlett	Emerson	LaFalce
Barton	English	Lagomarsino
Bateman	Erdreich	Lantos
Bates	Evans (IA)	Latta
Bedell	Evans (IL)	Leach (IA)
Beilenson	Fascell	Leath (TX)
Bennett	Fawell	Lehman (CA)
Bentley	Fazio	Lehman (FL)
Bereuter	Feighan	Leland
Berman	Fiedler	Lent
Bevill	Fields	Levin (MI)
Biaggi	Fish	Levine (CA)
Bilirakis	Flippo	Lewis (CA)
Billey	Florio	Lewis (FL)
Boehlert	Foglietta	Lightfoot
Boland	Ford (TN)	Lipinski
Boner (TN)	Fowler	Livingston
Bonior (MI)	Frank	Loeffler
Bonker	Franklin	Long
Borski	Frenzel	Lott
Bosco	Frost	Lowery (CA)
Boucher	Fuqua	Lowry (WA)
Boulter	Gallo	Lujan
Boxer	Garcia	Luken
Breaux	Gaydos	Lundine
Brooks	Gejdenson	Lungren
Broomfield	Gekas	Mack
Brown (CA)	Gibbons	MacKay
Brown (CO)	Gilman	Madigan
Broyhill	Gingrich	Manton
Bruce	Gonzalez	Markey
Bryant	Goodling	Marlenee
Burton (CA)	Gordon	Martin (IL)
Burton (IN)	Gradison	Martin (NY)
Byron	Gray (IL)	Martinez
Callahan	Green	Matsui
Campbell	Grotberg	Mavroules
Carney	Guarini	Mazzoli
Carper	Gunderson	McCain
Carr	Hall (OH)	McCandless
Chandler	Hall, Ralph	McDade
Chappell	Hall, Sam	McEwen
Chappie	Hamilton	McGrath
Cheney	Hammerschmidt	McHugh
Coats	Hansen	McKernan
Cobey	Hartnett	McKinney
Coble	Hatcher	McMillan
Coelho	Hayes	Meyers
Coleman (MO)	Hefner	Mica
Coleman (TX)	Heftel	Michel
Collins	Hendon	Mikulski
Combest	Henry	Miller (CA)
Conte	Hertel	Miller (OH)
Cooper	Hiler	Miller (WA)
Coughlin	Hillis	Mineta
Courter	Holt	Mitchell
Coyne	Hopkins	Moakley
Crane	Horton	Molinari
Daniel	Howard	Mollohan
Dannemeyer	Hoyer	Monson
Darden	Hubbard	Moody
Daub	Huckaby	Moore
Davis	Hughes	Moorhead
de la Garza	Hunter	Morrison (CT)
DeWine	Hutto	Morrison (WA)
Dickinson	Hyde	Mrazek
Dicks	Ireland	Murphy
Dingell	Jacobs	Murtha
DioGuardi	Jenkins	Myers

Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

□ 1430

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred and ninety-three Members have recorded their presence, a quorum is present, and the committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a recorded vote.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is as follows: Do I understand correctly that the amendment before the body about to be voted or on which a recorded vote has been requested and will be ordered is the Walker amendment to the Walgren amendment; the Walgren being a freeze amendment to the underlying proposal from the committee. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut is correct, and the Chair will make that clear again as the Chair puts the vote.

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered,

The CHAIRMAN. Members will have 5 minutes in which to record their votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 201, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—196

Applegate
Archer
Armey
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bennett
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonker
Bosco
Boulter
Breaux
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
English
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grotberg
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Heftel
Hendon
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Ireland
Jenkins
Johnson
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Porter
Ray
Regula
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Taylor
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weaver
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOES—201

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
Barnes
Bedell
Bellenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Carper
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
de la Garza
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Howard
Hoyer
Hutto
Jacobs
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Scheuer
Schneider
Schumer
Sharp
Shelby
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (FL)
Snowe
Solarz
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Weiss
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Boggs
Bustamante
Clay
Clinger
Conyers
Daschle
DeLay
Derrick
Dorgan (ND)
Early
Foley
Ford (MI)
Glickman
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Hawkins
Horton
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Lloyd
McCurdy
Montgomery
Quillen
Robinson
Savage
Schulze
Seiberling
Solomon
Stallings
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Traficant
Traxler
Waxman
Wylie

□ 1440

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. Ford of Michigan against.

Mr. Solomon for, with Mr. Hawkins against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Bustamante, against.

Messrs. VALENTINE, WATKINS, HUTTO, ANDREWS, and DE LA GARZA changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. BENTLEY changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

man from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—398

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Grotberg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOES—2

Frenzel
Williams

NOT VOTING—33

Ackerman
Boggs
Bustamante
Clay
Clinger
Conyers
Crane
DeLay
Derrick
Dorgan (ND)
Early
Foley
Ford (MI)
Glickman
Gregg
Hawkins
Horton
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Lloyd
McCurdy
Montgomery
Quillen
Robinson
Savage
Schulze
Seiberling
Solomon
Stallings
Thomas (CA)
Traficant
Traxler
Wylie

□ 1500

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. BENNETT] having assumed the chair, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1617) to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 128, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 282, noes 103, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES 282

Addabbo
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bliley
Boehlert
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel

Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Holt
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Shelby
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

NOES—103

Archer
Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Campbell
Chappie
Cheney
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Combest
Courter
Craig
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Fiedler
Fields
Franklin
Frenzel
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Grotberg
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Hubbard
Hunter
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Nielson
Penny
Petri
Roberts
Rogers
Schaefer
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Smith (NH)
Smith, Denny
Snyder
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Taylor
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Young (FL)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—48

Ackerman
Bates
Boggs
Boland
Broyhill
Bustamante
Clay
Clinger
Conyers
Crane
DeLay
Derrick
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Early
Foley
Ford (MI)
Glickman
Gregg
Hawkins
Horton
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kolter
Lloyd
McCurdy
Meyers
Montgomery
Myers
Panetta
Quillen
Robinson
Rose
Rudd
Savage
Schulze
Seiberling
Solomon
St Germain
Stallings
Thomas (CA)
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Weaver
Wortley
Wylie

□ 1520

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ford of Michigan for, with Mr. Rudd against.

Mr. Hawkins for, with Mr. Crane against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on H.R. 1617, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CRIME VICTIMS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to designate the week of April 14, 1985, as "Crime Victims Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, however, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 109

Whereas crime often inflicts considerable physical and emotional pain and financial hardship upon its victims, disrupting their lives, and placing great strains upon their families;

Whereas our criminal justice system has often failed to provide the victims of crime with the compassionate treatment they deserve;

Whereas it is the fundamental obligation of government to protect its citizens from the criminal element;

Whereas there is a national movement in support of more just and compassionate treatment of victims of crime;

Whereas the establishment of the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime and an Office for Victims of Crime in the Department of Justice, and enactment of the Victim and Witness Protection Act of 1982 and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 evidence the Federal Government's increased awareness of the plight of crime victims; and

Whereas further efforts are needed, at all levels of government and in the private sector, to help ease the trauma suffered by crime victims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating April 14 through April 20, 1985, as "Crime Victims Week" and calling upon the people of the United States, State and local government agencies, and interested organizations to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DES AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 63) to designate the week of April 21, 1985, through April 27, 1985, as "National DES Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, however, I do not object, but simply would like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation being considered.

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

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. I want to express my appreciation

to him and to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the urgent and immediate consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, diethylstilbestrol [DES], a powerful synthetic hormone, was prescribed to an estimated 3 million women in the United States from 1941 to 1971 for the purpose of reducing complications in childbirth. Use was continued despite reports as early as the 1950's that the drug was ineffective. It was not until early 1971 that use was banned by the Food and Drug Administration when medical research revealed a strong connection between DES and cancer of the reproductive organs. More recent studies have linked DES to cancers and abnormalities in mothers, daughters, and sons.

It is imperative that the women who took DES during pregnancy and their daughters and sons be made aware of the effects of the drug. Early detection and treatment are necessary to contain the resulting cancers and preserve the reproductive capabilities of DES' victims. The effort to reach these people has been difficult because of the time which has elapsed since exposure. Many women were not familiar with the drugs prescribed to them, and some are not aware of the risks now facing their children. "DES Awareness Week" is an important step in the effort to locate and educate the many men and women exposed to this dangerous drug.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 63

Whereas Diethylstilbestrol (DES), a powerful synthetic hormone was given to over three million pregnant women in the United States from 1941 to 1971 for the purpose of reducing miscarriages, despite reports as early as the 1950's that the drug was ineffective;

Whereas it is estimated that over three million "DES daughters and sons" were also exposed in utero;

Whereas mothers who have been exposed to DES have been demonstrated to have a higher incidence of breast cancer with that risk becoming increasingly more pronounced with age;

Whereas approximately one out of one-thousand DES daughters will develop a rare cancer of the cervix and vagina known as Clear-Cell Adenocarcinoma;

Whereas these cancer victims are subject to hysterectomies, vaginectomies and lymphotomies with a 25 percent possibility of death as a result of such exposure;

Whereas a second type of cervical and vaginal cancer known as cervical dysplasia (pre-cancerous) and carcinoma in situ (CIS) has been shown to have a higher incidence in DES daughters affecting more than eighty-thousand women with at least five thousand developing the actual cancer;

Whereas problems with pregnancies have been reported to affect a large proportion of DES daughters including ectopic pregnancies, miscarriages, infertility and premature deliveries;

Whereas DES sons have shown a higher incidence of maldescent of the testes, a known risk factor for testicular cancer; and

Whereas identification, appropriate evaluation, and treatment of individuals exposed to DES is dependent upon a greater public awareness: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of April 21, 1985, through April 27, 1985, is designated as "National DES Awareness Week" and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask, unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two Senate joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1530

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask to proceed for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I will be happy to.

Mr. WRIGHT. This concludes our business for the week. The legislative business schedule for this week has been concluded. There will be no session tomorrow, therefore.

We will ask unanimous consent that when we come in on Monday we convene at 3 p.m. on next Monday.

Mr. MICHEL. Will the distinguished majority leader mind advising the House as to why we would under normal circumstances coming in at 12 delay that until 3 on Monday?

Mr. WRIGHT. I will be delighted to respond.

There is scheduled, and has been for some long while, a dedication of the library at Queens College in New York in the memory of our late colleague, Ben Rosenthal. That ceremony takes place late morning on Monday next. The New York delegation desires to attend that ceremony and other Members desire to attend, and in deference to them and in the honor of our late colleague we are asking that the House convene at 3 p.m. rather than at 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. There are three bills planned to be taken up under suspension of the rules, all of them from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The first is a resolution condemning the Soviet Government for the murder of Maj. Arthur Nicholson, Jr.; another expressing support for Costa Rica's neutrality; and a third calling for the restoration of democracy in Chile.

Members should be advised, in addition to those three, that on Monday it is likely, assuming that the Committee on House Administration has completed its work and has made a finding with respect to the winner in the contested election in the Eighth District of Indiana, that a motion would be made to seat the winner, whoever he may be.

On Tuesday we will ask unanimous consent to convene at 9 o'clock in order that we may take up consideration of the bill scheduled for action by reason of the legislation adopted last year, appropriations for aid to the Contras in Nicaragua.

That, as the gentleman may know, is a 10-hour rule. We will be considering the rule providing for 10 hours of debate and a vote as the statute commands, providing also for an opportunity after that has been done, an opportunity for a substitute to be offered on behalf of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on Intelligence, and finally for a Republican motion to recommit which would be formed in whatever fashion the gentleman from Illinois or his designee may desire, and a guarantee that there will be an opportunity for the Members to vote on each of the three options.

Mr. MICHEL. I gather from what the distinguished majority leader is saying, your effort here is to circumvent the Appropriations Committee itself, who has original jurisdiction over the resolution which several Members on our side introduced; is that not correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not believe that I would express it in terms of circumvention. The Appropriations Committee, to my knowledge, is not objecting to this procedure which fulfills the law adopted by our Congress last year calling for a vote to be taken within a given envelope of time.

The purpose, therefore, I would describe not as, certainly not to circumvent the Committee on Appropriations, but rather to facilitate action by the House.

Mr. MICHEL. Can the gentleman tell me if the Rules Committee has ac-

tually met yet on the procedures the gentleman has outlined here briefly?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is my understanding, though I am subject to correction, that they are in the process of meeting now. I am not sure that that is true, but I think that is true.

Mr. MICHEL. So that I have no assurance of what kind of rule we are going to be talking about here until actually finally the committee has concluded its work?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that is true. You have no absolute assurance, nor have I. But I have described to you what I believe it will be.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. And what the Democratic leadership of the House has requested that it be.

Mr. MICHEL. And I assume then by way of brief review that would call for the 10 hours of debate originally prescribed in the continuing resolution, plus an opportunity for the chairman of the Intelligence Committee to offer whatever amendment he might want to offer, and reserving to this side an opportunity for a substitute, or would it be limited, or would it be a free-standing substitute or just a motion to recommit? Could the gentleman inform me?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am not able to answer the gentleman with specificity. It is my understanding, however, that it would reserve to the gentleman's side of the aisle the right to offer a motion to recommit in whatever manner the gentleman or his designee may prescribe it.

Mr. MICHEL. Might I further inquire as to the time that would be allocated beyond the 10 hours of general debate. If the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has an amendment, would there be a time allocation beyond the 10 hours of general debate for his amendment?

Mr. WRIGHT. It has been our purpose to request of the Rules Committee that 2 additional hours would be allowed for the substitutes to be discussed.

Mr. MICHEL. What kind of time would be reserved then to the minority?

Mr. WRIGHT. Half that time. Half that time, 1 of the 2 hours.

Mr. MICHEL. And would that include the time for offering our substitute if we chose to offer one, or would we have such time allocated to the minority?

Mr. WRIGHT. The minority, of course, would be free to use that time in such manner as it might choose to describe its own substitute, to extoll reasons for the virtues inherent in the minority substitute as superior in your view to those contained in the substitute offered by the chairman of the Committee on Intelligence. For whatever purpose the gentleman may desire to use the time, I think it would be available to him at his option.

Mr. MICHEL. I guess the bottom line, though, is if it is limited to a motion to recommit, would the time be limited to a mere 10 minutes, or would we be getting an hour of time?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would hope that the gentleman would elucidate the contents of the motion to recommit in the process of our debate in order that all Members might understand what was contained in the motion to recommit. I am not aware of any effort on the part of the Rules Committee to extend the normal time for motions to recommit.

If the gentleman desires that, he might want to consult with the Rules Committee members.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, the gentleman from Illinois has not been advised that there is an emergency meeting of the committee being held in order to testify in behalf of his own proposition. And I guess I raise the point that under normal rules of procedure, even under an emergency situation, the courtesy ought to be shown to at least the author of the resolution being considered that we are having an emergency meeting to consider your resolution. And I would make that point, and just for future reference, hopefully that we will make a point.

Mr. WRIGHT. I take the gentleman's point as well intentioned and a proper statement. I think it is surely the intention of the Democratic leadership to preserve and protect for the gentleman from Illinois whatever motion he may want to offer, and not to restrict him in any artificial way whatsoever.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman. I think I interrupted him when we were on about Tuesday.

Mr. WRIGHT. We were at Tuesday, and that is all that is planned for Tuesday. We would hope to be able to come in at 9 o'clock and would not schedule any other actions on Tuesday.

On Wednesday we would ask unanimous consent that we may be able to meet at noon in order that we may take up H.R. 2068, the State Department authorization bill. That, of course, is subject to the granting of a rule, but I know of no impediment to the rule being granted.

□ 1540

If we can complete these heretofore listed actions on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, then we would have a pro forma session on Thursday, meeting at 11 a.m. as prescribed in the general rules of the House and would not have to have a session on Friday, April 26.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1985, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON THAT DAY

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Tuesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESS AND THE CONTRAS

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Times-Picayune/the States-Item of New Orleans recently joined the growing ranks of influential journals backing President Reagan's program for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. The paper cannot understand why so many in this Congress have not done likewise. Frankly, I don't understand it either, and I doubt the American people will, should the aid package be defeated and Nicaragua be allowed to consolidate its antidemocratic state.

The Picayune reminds us of recent votes in this Congress for aid to Cambodians battling Vietnamese Communist invaders, and of congressional

support for covert aid to Afghan rebels fighting the Soviet puppet regime there. Then the paper hits the main point:

But what is really remarkable is that Congress should be concentrating opposition on countering a demonstrable threat to U.S. and free world interests right in our own neighborhood in Nicaragua. The opposition is full of arguments that seem to amount to little more than excuses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the President and to carefully consider the cogent Times-Picayune editorial, which follows in its entirety.

CONGRESS AND THE CONTRAS

Congressional sentiment is running generally against renewing aid to the "contras" battling the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. We find it remarkable, then, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee last week voted overwhelmingly to approve $5 million in military aid to Cambodians battling the Vietnamese communist invaders.

We find this remarkable because the Cambodians we would be providing money to are the lesser factions in a coalition that includes the savage communist Khmer Rouge. The chances of "our" group's prevailing are virtually nil.

We find it remarkable, too, that there is no congressional sticking at increasing our aid to the Afghans fighting the Soviets and the Soviet puppet regime. This aid is being funneled through the Central Intelligence Agency, a method many in Congress found so distasteful when applied to the contras. The Afghanistan resistance, too, is not likely to succeed.

Both these distant wars are of strategic importance to the United States. The conflict in Cambodia threatens our ally Thailand. The conflict in Afghanistan costs the Soviets money and threatens not only our ally Pakistan but threatens to achieve for the Russians their long-sought access to warm seas.

But what is really remarkable is that Congress should be concentrating opposition on countering a demonstrable threat to U.S. and free world interests right in our own neighborhood in Nicaragua. The opposition is full of arguments that seem to amount to little more than excuses.

The Sandinistas, for example, are only homegrown revolutionaries reacting to long-standing domestic problems. But, to continue, even if they are communists, they have the support of their people. The Sandinistas, some argue, have built their disproportionate military force purely in defense—against potentially hostile neighbors and the United States itself. The contras, some charge, are Somoza men bent on returning to dictatorship. In any event, for the clincher, the United States should not finance guerrillas against an established government we formally recognize.

None of this can stand up. The Sandinistas were one faction in a broad uprising against the Somoza dictatorship, and when Somoza was expelled, they took full power and set up their own proto-dictatorship; the contras are the other uprisers who are still trying to establish a pluralistic democracy. The United States is helping them finish the revolution, whose goals coincide with our own.

An entrenched Sandinista regime, even if Cuba and the Soviets lifted not a finger nor provided a cent to its victory, would be a Soviet comrade on the hemisphere's mainland and an exporter of its own brand of dictatorship in a region of direct strategic importance to us.

Congress must stand in defense of our and our free (or freeable) neighbors—the amount and the means being, to some extent, negotiable. If it does not, it will be sending a signal to the Soviets and their potential agents that the United States has lost its nerve and has no stomach for resisting the program of aggression by proxy that serves them far better than nuclear missile rattling in expanding their global power.

HOLLYWOOD STARS LOBBY AGAINST AID FOR FREEDOM FIGHTERS

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, this week a group of Hollywood stars with limited foreign policy knowledge or experience invaded the Halls of this Congress to lobby against aid for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters.

The stars are beautiful, persuasive people but have any of my colleagues met face to face with people who have been disfigured, imprisoned, and tortured by the Marxist Sandinstas? Why haven't my colleagues talked to those who tell a story different from what they want to hear, a story of brothers and sisters, sons and daughters being brutally tortured, disfigured, by the Sandinistas? Do the Hollywood stars know or care that last year the Soviet Union sent more than $250 million in military aid to Nicaragua. The American public should ask is that foreign intervention, $250 million for activities to destroy democracy.

While we do nothing but equivocate, for the first time Soviet military officers are engaged in the fighting in Nicaragua. Castro said his Cuba will, and I quote, "continue arming and training terrorists in Central America." Do the Hollywood stars know this? Are they of the same ilk as those who fought along side of Castro in the hills of Cuba.

I ask you, what does this Nation and this Congress stand for if it does not have the guts to say no to the pro Marxists lobbyists, no to the Soviets fighting in Nicaragua, and no to the Sandinistas.

Today I am introducing parts 3 and 4 of the Washington, DC's major newspaper, the Times "Network" articles entitled "Accuracy and Balance, Lies and Deception."

Read the "Network" articles to see who the real enemy is.

ACCURACY, BALANCE OF WOLA FOUND LACKING BY ITS CRITICS

(By Roger Fontaine)

When a congressional delegation arrived in Managua in 1979 shortly after the Sandinista takeover, a member of the group recalls that the first person they met at the airport was an employee of the Washington Office on Latin America.

According to at least one report, a WOLA staffer later showed up at the U.S. ambassador's residence on the arm of one of the Sandinista comandantes. The comandante, Jaime Wheelock, was then as now in charge of the regime's agriculture program.

Among the hundreds of groups that comprise the left-wing "Network" working to radically influence the administration's policies toward Central and Latin America, WOLA could probably lay claim to being one of the most senior, if not effective, in its area.

Founded in 1974—and therefore "ancient" as these organizations go—WOLA is headquartered on Maryland Avenue on Capitol Hill, almost across the street from the Supreme Court in a suite of offices located in the United Methodist Church building.

A major focus of WOLA's activities is Nacaragua. WOLA is providing information in opposition to the Reagan administration's proposed assistance to the resistance forces fighting the Sandinista government.

Unlike some other groups in The Network, WOLA is not a "one-man-with-a-mimeo" affair—the kind of political activist group that once flourished in the heat of Vietnam but then was left to wither.

Rather, WOLA is established Part of its funding comes from such respectable sources as the MacArthur Foundation and Ford Foundation as well as from mainline church bodies. In 1983, WOLA raised $340,866, more than one-third of it from religious organizations, according to its Annual Report.

The key to WOLA's effectiveness, according to one former legislative staffer familiar with the organization, lies in its ability to provide a steady stream of information to members of Congress and their staffs. "On Capitol Hill, information is everything," the former aide said.

But it is the accuracy and balance of WOLA's information that its critics have called into question.

WOLA literature describes the organization as "an information source for interested officials, providing resources for documenting information, briefing those traveling to Latin America, facilitating interviews between prominent Latin American leaders and U.S. officials, organizing background briefings for congressional staff and giving testimony before congressional committees."

Amid all these activities, one of the major criticisms leveled at WOLA is for practicing a double standard on human rights.

Governments and organizations that are either anti-communist or non-communist, particularly if they are U.S. allies, typically come under WOLA's close scrutiny, while allegations of human rights violations by socialist states, such as Nicaragua and Cuba, are not subjected to the same degree of attention.

"It means all criticsm is directed at one set of problems, and that leads to an unbalanced situation," one WOLA critic said.

"WOLA has been a faithful spokesman for the Sandinistas and El Salvador's guerrillas," said a State Department offical.

"They [WOLA] consistently have distorted the fatalities in El Salvador and blurred it so it all appears to be coming from the right," the official said.

Penn Kemble, founder and director of the Institute on Religion and Democracy, said of this double standard, "from a Christian

perspective that argument is wholly unacceptable.

"Christians are obliged to judge all governments and institutions from the standpoint of the churches," Mr. Kemble said.

Castro's Cuba has received mention in WOLA reports only in the context of U.S.-Cuban relations. Human rights abused documented by the Organization of American States and other organizations have been largely ignored.

In fact, according to Update's 1984 index, Cuba went unmentioned the entire year, despite the fact that the newsletter had space for 44 articles on 12 other Latin American countries.

"Our interest is helping to make available to the public a concern for the way, the effect, the impact that U.S. policies have on people who live in this hemisphere," said Joseph T. Eldridge, WOLA's director, in an interview.

Contributions in 1983 from religious institutions totaled $124,602, according to WOLA's Annual Report. Some of the contributors included the National Council of Churches, the American Lutheran Churches, American Baptist Churches, Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, Maryknoll Sisters, the Presbyterian Church, the Episcopal Church and Jesuit Missions.

Mr. Eldridge, a Methodist clergyman, is paid his salary by the United Methodist Church Board of Global Ministries, according to a Heritage Foundation analysis published in 1984.

Although WOLA's annual budget may be small by Washington standards, observers point out that WOLA increases its budget's effectiveness by using hardworking volunteers.

Not all critics, however, speak harshly of WOLA.

Elliott Abrams, head of the State Department's Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, said WOLA "has political prejudices just as we all do, but it makes a real effort to promote human rights progress.

"So while I disagree with WOLA, I work with them."

Some sources, including critical ones, give WOLA credit for quality reporting on some aspects of Latin America.

One former Foreign Service officer critical of WOLA's support of the Sandinista government, nevertheless credits the organization for "excellent, responsible, objective reporting . . . on various issues—both political and human rights."

But not on Nicaragua.

"I find it difficult to explain why they [WOLA] have taken this turn to the left and why they are associated with this so-called Sandinista lobby since they have projected themselves earlier as a very reputable, balanced, objective research organization," the former officer said.

Mr. Eldridge told The Times that, "Our concern is whether U.S. policy either encourages or discourages human rights.

"Our view is that what Latin America needs is not a lot of emphasis on military support. Rather, what Latin America needs is economic development and social change," he said.

In the recent past, WOLA also has opposed the bipartisan Kissinger Commission report on Central America. Mr. Eldridge said WOLA opposed the Kissinger Plan because it "places a lot of emphasis on military support for the region."

But WOLA was also opposed to El Salvador's land reform, according to one U.S. consultant who worked on the program.

"They [WOLA] were worse than the landlords," the consultant said "Land reform just drove them up the wall. They really hated it."

Earlier when the Sandinista opposition in Nicaragua was struggling to overthrow the government of Anastasio Somoza Debayle, WOLA participated in exposing the former president's human rights record and also introduced pro-Sandinista spokesmen to Washington—particularly to members of Congress and the media.

Some of its more prominent guests were Ernesto Cardenal and Miguel D'Escoto. As priests, they were particularly effective witnesses before congressional committees, observers recall. Later, both joined the Sandinista government.

Nicaragua's Marxist Sandinista regime has been in power for nearly six years. WOLA, according to its critics, has put the best face it can on that regime's human rights record, first and foremost, by not reporting on it.

Mr. Eldridge contends that WOLA has been critical of the Managua regime.

"We're not here to exonerate the Sandinistas." he said.

"We've been highly critical of Sandinistas [in direct communications with them]" he said "Our concern is to do what we can to create a climate in the United States international public opinion, to bring all pressures on both sides.

* * * * *

U.S. labor officials contacted by The Times said that, to their knowledge, WOLA has not shown any interest in the Nicaraguan government's suppression of independent labor unions in that country—unions that have the support of the State Department, AFL-CIO and others.

WOLA remains active on the Nicaraguan front. In late February, for example, WOLA and the International Human Rights Law Group requested a follow-up investigation of alleged atrocities committed in Nicaragua—not by the Sandinista government, but its armed opposition.

For a week, two investigators toured Nicaragua to investigate allegations made by New York attorney Reed Brody.

Their investigation was limited to the FDN (Fuerza Democratica Nicaraguense). They described the FDN as a group that has received support from the CIA and whose military leaders are "former Somoza National Guard officers."

Thirty people were interviewed, according to the authors of the report, and their principal conclusion was "the Contras are committing serious abuses against civilians."

"The weight of probative evidence indicates a reasonable basis to believe that the Contras engage in arts of terroristic violence against unarmed civilians."

The authors also drew a policy conclusion: "To the extent that it is reasonably foreseeable that they will continue to engage in such acts, any provision of aid to the Contras, directly or indirectly, by the government of the United States would render our government responsible for their acts."

The report of the two investigators received Mr. Eldridge's approval.

"Our report took some of the affidavits that Mr. Brody had collected to see if they could be validated, to see if in fact there was some substance to these charges," he said.

"I found that these accusations had been collected as a matter of fact were, in fact, true, discovering there was a pattern [of atrocities]." he said.

Some previous supporters of the Sandinistra revolution have become disillusioned with WOLA.

Geraldine Macias and her husband were supporters of the Sandinistas before and for three years after the revolution. They left Nicaragua in 1982 and came to the United States after government-led mobs burned their house.

Mrs. Macias, who is now vice president for the Washington-based New Exodus—an organization aiding Central American refugees—said she contacted the WOLA staff and explained what happened to her and her husband. Mrs. Macias said that, after making a few telepone calls to Managua, WOLA "did nothing"

Mrs. Macias said that WOLA was nothing more than "an apologist for the Sandinistas."

Adriana Guillen, a Sandinista supporter during the revolution and an officer in the Sandinista government for six months tells of a similar experience.

"Several times, I have been contacted by COHA (Council on Hemspheric Affairs) or WOLA and I have also called Americas Watch . . . So they know the sources, they know where to go and find the information. But they don't care . . . about reflecting the truth," she says

"We have not hesitated in our communication with government representatives to raise objections and criticisms that are presented to us."

Regarding Miss Guillen, he replied, "I don't know what her expectations were," adding he tries to pass along such reports whenever he receives them.

Miss Guillen's disillusionment has led her to conclude that WOLA and other organizations "are dealing with protecting the left, not protecting human rights."

CISPES' STRATEGY: LIES AND DECEPTION FOR SALVADORAN LEFT

(By Bill Outlaw)

In "The Network" of organizations that are engaged in a massive effort to turn opinion against U.S. policies toward Central America, CISPES is one of the more active and visible.

"CISPES has launched a national grass-roots canvassing effort to reach hundreds of thousands of people in their communities and bring many new people into active opposition," according to a CISPES report.

But CISPES appears to be much more than just another "grass-roots" organization disagreeing with specific administration policies.

Documents obtained by The Washington Times and CISPES own publications reveal that the organization openly supports the Marxist Sandinista guerrillas (FMLN-FDR) in El Salvador and elsewhere in Central America.

Moreover, documents indicate that CISPES was itself a creation of the FMLN-FDR and was, among other things, designed to generate support for guerrilla activity in El Salvador among members of the U.S. Congress and the American public.

CISPES organizers in Washington did not return several telephone calls from The Times for comment. But one researcher reports that CISPES officials have denied the allegations.

An integral component of CISPES activity is to counter Reagan administration policies in Central America.

"Stop U.S. Military Intervention in Central America," reads a headline on the front

page of CISPES' April issue of Alert. "Support human freedom and dignity by also ending intervention in the Caribbean, Middle East, Asia, the Pacific and Europe."

Administration officials and observers of the group say CISPES is the largest and most effective of the solidarity organizations, which include the National Network in Solidarity with the People of Nicaragua, the Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala and the Network in Solidarity with the People of Central America.

Solidarity groups exist for other regions as well, such as for the people of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

CISPES offices in Washington are located on the seventh floor at 930 F St. NW, next to the office for the Guatemalan solidarity group. The Nicaraguan solidarity group used to be located there, but they have moved to a nearby location on I Street NW.

Observers of the organizations report that they often appear together at protests and demonstrations. However, there is no specific evidence to link these groups.

CISPES' own literature claims that the organization has grown to more than 300 local chapters and affiliates, with seven regional offices.

Each local chapter "includes a series of outreach groups oriented toward the religious community, organized labor, schools, and other community groups and organizations," a CISPES brochure distributed in 1984 states.

CISPES literature further states that it "lobbies Congress, coordinates protest efforts, and conducts humanitarian aid campaigns."

"CISPES activities include fund raising and legislative campaigns, educational and outreach programs, and mass mobilizations, conducted on national regional and local grassroots levels" according to Alert.

CISPES has taken part in or has helped organize many of the major protest demonstrations in the United States over the past few years. Its most recent efforts will be seen in the upcoming "Four Days In April" protest in Washington scheduled for April 19-22.

According to a CISPES document entitled, "CISPES Structure and Funding," other major activities in which the group has organized or participated in include:

A "massive demonstration" in Washington on March 27, 1982, that was timed to coincide with "the U.S. orchestrated elections" in El Salvador.

A "people-to-people" aid drive to provide medical assistance to Salvadorans "living in the FMLN-FDR zones of control. Through hundreds of grass-roots fund-raising activities, CISPES committees raised more than $150,000, surpassing the goal of the campaign."

"Highly visible protest actions including civil disobedience" at Fort Benning, Ga., and Fort Bragg, N.C., where Salvadoran troops were being trained by U.S. soldiers.

A rally at the State Department to protest the "presidential certification amid growing human rights violations in El Salvador."

A protest at the Honduran embassy and consulates in major cities to oppose "Honduran intervention in El Salvador and the growing use of Honduras as a base of U.S. directed military operations in the region."

CISPES and some other solidarity groups have also promoted letterwriting campaigns about U.S. policy to members of Congress and to U.S. officials in other parts of the world, according to CISPES literature and other sources.

According to Greg Lagana, who was a press attache at the U.S. embassy in El Salvador from 1982 to 1984, the embassy received hundreds of form letters and telephone calls from U.S. citizens during the time he was there.

These calls and letters were protesting alleged atrocities committed by the U.S.-backed government, Mr. Lagana said.

Mr. Lagana said he could not prove the telephone calls or letters were encouraged by CISPES or an affiliated group, but he said the embassy received calls about alleged atrocities involving labor unions members in El Salvador from some labor unions in the United States. Telephone calls concerning teachers in El Salvador came from some teachers in the United States, and calls about health care came from some health care solidarity groups.

But what disturbed Mr. Lagana the most, he said, was that the information the U.S. citizens were commenting on was frequently wrong or misleading at best.

As an example, he said some human rights groups in El Salvador who were known to be sympathetic to the Sandinistas would put out information that civilians had been killed in guerrilla skirmishes with government troops when what really happened was that some guerrillas themselves had been killed. But calls would come pouring in anyway to the U.S. embassy from Americans complaining about civilian atrocities committed by government troops.

Quite often Mr. Lagana said, the complaints were form letters which contained a "central Spanish syntax that a native speaker of English would not use. That led me to conclude they were being written in Salvador," Mr. Lagana said.

CISPES activities on college campuses were well organized three or four years ago, said a trade union official who frequently spoke at various colleges nationwide.

According to an article published by Inter Press Service in New York on Dec. 3, 1984, CISPES "has also been visited by FBI agents and many of its 10,000 members have been questioned."

Inter Press also stated that the group "has also been infiltrated by FBI officials," citing an alleged "FBI internal document that CISPES lawyers obtained under the Freedom of Information Act."

A story in this month's Alert, CISPES' monthly publication, outlines what they call a recent case "involving the FBI's seizure of a personal address book and diary" of Ed Hasse, as he was returning home from a trip to Nicaragua. Mr. Hasse works for the National Network in Solidarity with The Nicaraguan People, the report said.

A spokesman for the FBI said yesterday, "The FBI does not expand on documents that have been released under the Freedom of Information Act. They stand by themselves.

Regarding Mr. Hasse's claim, "it is before the courts and it would be inappropriate to comment," the spokesman said.

The Fund for a Conservative Majority (FCM), in November filed a letter of complaint against CISPES to the Federal Election Commission. The FCM alleged that CISPES "apparently violated the provisions of [the law] in making expenditures for the purpose of financing communications which expressly advocate the defeat of Ronald Reagan."

An Associated Press report quoted Van Gosse, a national student organizer for CISPES, as saying. "We have taken an explicit position that we have not endorsed any presidential candidate * * *."

A spokesman on behalf of the FCM said they have not heard back from the FEC regarding their complaint.

"They were on every campus [he went to], they provided speakers, they had their membership at the meetings with banners who would heckle speakers with opposing points of view," the official said.

He added that the harassment often was so great that many of the meetings were disrupted. But the official added that recently, "they lost their punch."

"Meetings are orderly now, and while the college audiences may not be sympathetic, they will listen," the official said.

He said he has noticed a decline in CISPES activities on college campuses recently—a decline he attributes to Salvadoran President Jose Napoleon Duarte's victory in the elections.

Nonetheless, CISPES remains active in other areas, and its activities have not gone unnoticed by others.

The Committee Strategy Proposal obtained by The Washington Times states that the group had established the following goals for 1984:

"1. Impede the escalation of U.S. intervention in Central America by (a) making the political costs of a full-scale, direct intervention too high; (b) obstructing the step-by-step escalation of U.S. Intervention in Central America.

"2. Provide political and material support to the FMLN-FDR of El Salvador; and

"3. Defend the Sandinista reputation.

"Our defense of the Sandinista revolution will directly contribute to the Nicaraguan people's efforts to consolidate their revolution," the document states. "It will also undermine Reagan's attempts to build a 'strategic consensus' in the U.S. for intervention in all of Central America."

Other CISPES literature describes its "public projection strategies (propaganda)" for 1984:

"Portray each stage of U.S. intervention as a step toward a Vietnam war. Project the urgency of stopping intervention.

"Project an emerging 'Vietnam war-type' movement.

"Project Reagan as a warmonger and his policies as a threat to world peace.

"Refocus concern on the issues of human rights and democracy in Central America.

"Project the advances being made by the people of Central America, particularly in Nicaragua and the FMLN-FDR zones of control."

Some critics raise questions about CISPES' origins.

According to independent research studies and documents released by the State Department, CISPES was formed in 1980 as a result of an organizational tour by an agent for the Salvadoran FMLN guerrillas.

In February and March 1980, a Farid Handal traveled to the United States for the purpose of "the creation of the International Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador," according to a report he made after the trip.

A copy of the report was obtained by Salvadoran military officials after a raid on a guerrilla location in El Salvador, according to the State Department, which subsequently released the report and a translation.

Mr. Handal's purpose in coming to the United States was to "coordinate" activities among the already-existing "solidarity committees," including non-communist, political, religious and human rights groups, in order to form a nationwide umbrella organization in support of the FMLN-FDR "with

the help of the CPUSA [Communist Party USA]," according to the documents.

According to his report, Mr. Handal stated, ". . . the offices of Congressman Dellums were turned into our offices. Everything was done there."

Mr. Handal also met with other congressmen in Washington and with officials from the Cuban Mission to the United Nations in New York, he wrote.

The Communist Party USA (CPUSA) and the United States Peace Council (USPC) were both instrumental in aiding Mr. Handal in his efforts to form a solidarity committee, he wrote.

* * * the Directorate of the CPUSA, among them "the person responsible for the U.S. Peace Council," according to the documents.

That individual was Sandy Pollack, who Mr. Handal identified as the "solidarity coordinator for the U.S. Peace Council."

"Sandy proposed a national conference under the auspices of the US Peace Council, the National Council of Churches, Amnesty International, WOLA, and various important unions of the US," Mr. Handal wrote.

"The objective of the conference would be to establish a support mechanism for the solidarity committees in those states where it does not already exist," he wrote.

Ms. Pollack died in a plane crash on a flight from Cuba to Nicaragua last January.

An FBI report released in 1982 entitled "Soviet Active Measures," states that at the time of Mr. Handal's trip to the United States, the FMLN was setting up a political front in Mexico City.

In June 1980, Salvadoran leftists created the United Revolutionary Directorate (DRU), the central political and military planning and tasking operation for the insurgents, the report states.

Mike Waller, an analyst and coauthor of a soon-to-be published book on "The Revolution Lobby," said that CISPES has engaged in "a massive effort to oppose Reagan administration policies."

They "called for the establishment of 'solidarity committees'" worldwide "to serve as propaganda outlets, conduits for aid, and organizers of solidarity meetings and demonstrations," Mr. Waller wrote. The first solidarity committee was CISPES, he said.

On March 13, 1980, FMLN Radio Venceremos in El Salvador reported: "We have organized a large solidarity apparatus that encompasses the whole planet, even in the United States, where one of the most active centers of solidarity exists."

CISPES leaders have denied that the group was founded or influenced by the FMLN, according to Mr. Waller.

Some CISPES critics charge that the group's activities should require them to register as an agent of a foreign government under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act requires that organizations in the United States which are acting on behalf of foreign powers to register as agents and make reports identifying their lobbying activities, expenditures and literature it distributes.

According to officials, it may be difficult to investigate groups to determine whether or not they should come under the act. And proving that an organization is acting on behalf of a foreign power is often difficult, according to officials.

Joel Lisker, who was in charge of enforcing the Foreign Agents Registration Act for the Justice Department, said the law needs to be "* * * authority akin to administrative subpoena power," Mr. Lisker said. He is now staff director for the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism.

According to another official, it is difficult for the Justice Department to collect information about organizations unless the groups cooperate or unless the Justice Department has "probable cause" to seek grand jury action or request an FBI investigation.

"CISPES' objective is a guerrilla victory in El Salvador by the [guerrillas]," said Sam Dickens, Latin American expert for the American Security Council Foundation. "In fact," he said, "it's the propaganda arm of the FDR in the U.S.

Without any question they should be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act," Mr. Dickens said. "I'm greatly disturbed that they have not—to my knowledge—been investigated by the FBI."

□ 1120

REAGANISTAS VERSUS COMMUNISTAS

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, let justice be done. Please seat Rick McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, we are entering into one of those extremely tense periods in the history of our Congress where there is going to be copious impassioned oratory on this House floor about the President's foreign policy in Central America. Yesterday one of your leaders on the majority side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, referred to the Contra democratic resistance freedom fighters as "Reaganistas." Has a certain ring to it, doesn't it? One of the distinguished Members of my side of the aisle with a bicultural Hispanic background remarked later, "I rather like the sound of that, 'Reaganistas.' Yes, the Reaganistas versus the 'Communistas.'" I'll accept that characterization.

Well, if that is the way this debate unfolds next week, Mr. Speaker, so be it.

However, in the interests of collegiality and fair play, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, "en garde" to you and your team opposing the foreign policy of the President of the United States.

As a great American, and I have referred to you more than once in that manner on this House floor, prepare to hear the words of one of your heros, President John F. Kennedy, repeated over and over and over again on my side of the aisle in the debate next week. Because it is the Kennedy doctrine, I and others will be espousing and defending here in the debate on aid to the Nicaraguan resistance.

I stand before you as a proud Republican who repeats again what I have told you before, that the best Presidential speech I have ever heard in my life was the inauguration address of young President John F. Kennedy on a biting cold January in 1961. In that magnificent rallying call for freedom, President Kennedy laid it on the line. His words ring down through the decades as true and relevant as the day he spoke them.

Mr. Speaker, the Communists are in control of the Government in Managua. You and your leadership team are on the wrong side again.

Here is the recently declassified series of minibios on the nine Commandantes, study them. Please. And support your President.

I repeat what was told to me by Commando Eden Pastora, the number one original Sandinistas' combatant, the hero of the July 19, 1979, revolutionary takeover of Managua. Pastora maintains that "not one of the nine ever heard a shot in combat against Samoza." Of course they did rob banks a decade earlier. Bank robbing is hardly to be compared with military combat. Bank guards, while sometimes armed, are not comparable to trained soldiers.

I submit for the RECORD the bios of the Managua Communistas. I chose support to the Reaganistas, those who serve with the Democratic resistance forces.

The material is as follows:

JOSÉ DANIEL ORTEGA (PHONETIC: OR TAY GA)

President (since January 1985).

Addressed as: Comandante Ortega.

Elected President of Nicaragua in November 1984, Daniel Ortega continues to be a member of the nine-man National Directorate of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), which was formed in 1979. During 1981–84 he also served as Coordinator of the Junta of the Government of National Reconstruction, a post which gained him at least de facto recognition as chief of state. He is a committed Marxist-Leninist, who often appears to view the world almost solely in terms of his own political beliefs. He announced in a June 1984 interview that his government was holding elections "in order to go beyond the notions of traditional bourgeois democracy" and "to consolidate the revolutionary government."

Ortega has been particularly acerbic in his criticism of President Ronald Reagan, calling him a witch hunter and a McCarthyite. He has also accused the Reagan administration of seeking to "Vietnamize" Central America. In addition, he has praised the aid Nicaragua receives from Cuba and the Soviet Union.

Ortega, 39, comes from a family that was heavily involved in the guerrilla war to topple the Somoza regime. His brother, Humberto, is a member of the FSLN National Directorate, Minister of Defense, and Commander in Chief of the Sandinista People's Army. A third brother, Camilo, was killed during the anti-Somoza insurrection. During the early 1960's Daniel was a member of the leftist Revolutionary Student Front. He joined the FSLN in the mid-1960s and was arrested in 1967 for robbing a bank. In late 1974, after FSLN negotiations with the government to exchange several prominent Nicaraguans held hostage by the FSLN, Ortega was released and went into self-imposed exile in Cuba. Because he was a leader of the insurrection that toppled the

Somoza government, Ortega holds the honorary rank of comandante de la revolución (commander of the revolution). The Ortega brothers lead the Tercerista Faction of the FSLN. Ortega is married and has at least three children.

JAIME STANLEY WHEELOCK ROMÁN (PHONETIC: WEELOKE)

Minister of Agrarian Reform and of Agricultural and Cattle Development.

Addressed as: Mr. Minister.

Jaime Wheelock has been Minister of Agrarian Reform since July 1979 and of Agricultural and Cattle Development since December 1979. In addition, he has been a member of the nine-man National Directorate, the decisionmaking body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), since March 1979. He is also a member of the newly created (January 1985) National Planning Council, which drafts economic guidelines for the directorate. He holds two party positions: coordinator of the State Committee and member of the Political Committee. Wheelock is often described in the press as the least ideological of the directorate members, but he was quoted in a 1983 interview as saying, "When Lenin led the Bolsheviks to the seizure of power . . . socialism triumphed. . . . The Soviet Union . . . has helped the revolutions on all continents, particularly in small countries, to have their path better cleared."

Wheelock has stated that the appointment of a member of the FSLN National Directorate to the Agrarian Reform portfolio demonstrates the importance of agriculture and the peasants to the Sandinista leaders. After the FSLN came to power, the Agrarian Reform Ministry announced a program in which land ownership would take one of three forms: large-scale production state farms, agricultural cooperatives, and individually owned plots. Wheelock's 1983 agrarian reform program has not been able to make improvements in Nicaragua's agricultural output.

Wheelock has visited numerous countries, including Costa Rica, the United States, and Libya, on behalf of the Government of National Reconstruction and the FSLN. He has accused the United States of attempting to isolate Nicaragua economically, subjugating the Costa Rican Government, turning Honduras into a fascist-like state, and intervening in El Salvador.

Wheelock comes from a wealthy family. He is a former law professor. According to press reports, he was accused of killing a National Guard officer in 1970. He subsequently fled to Chile, where he studied agricultural law. In 1973, he returned to Nicaragua, where he remained underground until emerging as a guerrilla commander during the civil war against President Anastasio Somoza in the late 1970s. He is a leading member of the Proletariat Faction of the FSLN. Because he was a leader of the insurrection that toppled the Somoza government, Wheelock holds the honorary rank of *comandante de la revolución* (commander of the revolution).

Wheelock, 37, has written two political monographs. He is married to the former Vanesa Castro Cardenal, who is a member of the Sandinista Assembly and the State Committee. She is related to Minister of Culture Ernesto Cardenal.

CARLOS NUNEZ TELLEZ (PHONETIC: NOONYEHS)

President, National Assembly (since January 1985).

Addressed as: Mr. President.

Carlos Nunez has been a member of the nine-man National Directorate of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) since 1979. He has actually headed Nicaragua's legislature since 1979, when he became President of the Council of State (the legislature during 1979-84). Nunez has a reputation as a political lightweight who follows the lead of others. Under his guidance, the National Assembly has become little more than a rubberstamp. It is charged with writing a new constitution and passing laws; however, no bill reaches the floor without Nunez approval, and no bills pass without the consent of the FSLN majority in the Assembly. Nunez is also head of the Propaganda and Political Education Department of the FSLN and takes a frequent hand in the direction of the official FSLN daily newspaper, Barricada. He is unimaginative, however, and often falls back on dogmatic rhetoric. Nunez has publicly accused the United States of destabilizing Central America.

Nunez has been described in the press as an experienced guerrilla. Because he was a leader of the insurrection that brought the FSLN to power, he holds the honorary rank of commandante de le revolucion (commander of the revolution). He is a member of the Proletariat Faction of the FSLN. Since 1979 he has traveled to the Soviet Union, Cuba, the United States, and Eastern and Western Europe on behalf of the FSLN.

Nunez, 33, is married to the daughter of Central Bank President Joaquin Cuadra Chamorro and is the brother-in-law of Army Chief of Staff Joaquin Cuadra Lacayo. Two of his brother and a sister hold high-level government or party positions.

HENRY ILDEFONSO RUIZ HERNÁNDEZ (PHONETIC: ROOEES)

Minister of Foreign Cooperation (since January 1985).

Addressed as: Mr. Minister.

Henry Ruíz has been a member of the National Directorate, the decisionmaking body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), since March 1979 and a member of the State Committee of the FSLN since September 1980. As Minister of Foreign Cooperation, he is responsible for developing foreign trade and dealing with international trade organizations. He is also an important member of the National Planning Council, a Cabinet committee that provides the nine-man directorate with economic policy guidelines and suggestions. He served during 1979-84 as Minister of Planning and was responsible for formulating and implementing Nicaraguan economic policies. Many times Ruíz has denounced what he calls US economic aggression against Nicaragua. During the past six years he has traveled extensively in Soviet Bloc countries to gain economic and political support for the Sandinista government.

Ruíz received his early education in Nicaragua, where he won awards as best student in several schools. In the late 1960s he studied for a year in Moscow at Patrice Lumumba University on a scholarship from the Nicaraguan Socialist Party. Upon his return to Nicaragua, he joined the FSLN's armed struggle against President Anastasio Somoza Debayle. In late 1967 Ruíz was sent to Cuba for six months of training. Before the FSLN takeover in 1979, he spent much of his time in the mountains of northern Nicaragua. Because he was a guerrilla leader in the insurrection that brought the FSLN to power, Ruíz holds the honorary rank of commandante de la revolución (commander of the revolution). He is a member of Tomás Borge's Prolonged Popular War Faction of the FSLN.

Ruíz is 41 years old.

BAYARDO ARCE CASTAÑO (PHONETIC: ARSAY)

Member, National Directorate, Sandinista National Liberation Front (since March 1979).

Addressed as: Comandante Arce.

Former journalist and professor Bayardo Arce is one of the most hard line of the nine members of the National Directorate of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). From May until September 1980 he was President of the State Council, and he has served since September 1980 as coordinator of the FSLN Political Committee and its National Secretariat. Since the FSLN came to power in July 1979, Arce has consistently manifested hostility toward the United States in his public statements. He has accused this country of having warlike intentions toward Nicaragua and of being the main cause of his country's economic problems. In a May 1984 address to leaders of the Moscow-line Nicaraguan Socialist Party on the basic goals of the Sandinista leadership, he affirmed that "Sandinism is . . . Marxism" and explained that "we have not, [however], declared this publicly and officially" because "our strategic allies tell us not to declare ourselves Marxist-Leninist, not to declare socialism."

Acre holds a degree in journalism from the National Autonomous University of Nicaragua. During his student days there he worked for two years (1968-70) as a reporter for the opposition daily *La Prensa* and served as vice president (1969-70) of the student governing body. He first became involved with the FSLN in 1971, when he was a member of the Revolutionary Student Front, a Communist group affiliated with the Sandinistas. Arce travels to Cuba frequently, and he has represented the FSLN at meetings of the Socialist International. Because he was a guerrilla leader in the insurrection that brought the FSLN to power, he holds the honorary rank of *comandante de la revolución* (commander of the revolution). He is a member of Tomás Borge's Prolonged Popular War Faction of the FSLN.

Arce, who is about 35, is married and has children.

HUMBERTO ORTEGA SAAVEDRA (PHONETIC: ORTAYGA)

Commander in Chief, Sandinista, People's Army; Minister of Defense.

Addressed as: Mr. Minister.

In addition to serving as Commander in Chief of the Sandinista People's Army (since August 1979) and as Minister of Defense (since December 1979), Humberto Ortega has been Commander of the Sandinista People's Militia since July 1981. He has also been a member of the National Directorate, the decisionmaking body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), since March 1979. He serves as coordinator of the Defense and Security Committee of the FSLN and is a member of the party's Political Committee. He has traveled to various countries, including Cuba, the USSR, and Vietnam, to establish military supply and training relationships. In a well-publicized speech in 1981 Ortega equated Sandinism with Marxism-Leninism. US Drug Enforcement Agency investigations during 1983-84 indicated that Ortega was aware that drugs were being illegally transported through Nicaragua.

According to the press, Ortega has said that his country's military buildup is the result of mounting internal and external counterrevolutionary threats. As Defense Minister, he has stressed that strengthening

defense in the face of what he calls US aggression is the first priority of the revolution. In statements in the spring of 1983, he threatened the Honduran Government with internal reprisals from Honduran leftists if it continued to support the anti-Sandinista forces. He has threatened to hang members of the opposition from lamp posts in the event of any armed intervention in his country. According to a September 1983 New York magazine article, Ortega implied that he would be willing to spread the revolution in Central America. He stated, "Of course we are not ashamed to be helping El Salvador. We would like to help all revolutions."

The son of revolutionaries, Ortega became active at an early age in a student movement dedicated to overthrowing President Anastasio Somoza Debayle. He joined the FSLN in the mid-1960s, and by 1972 he had become one of its leaders. His revolutionary activities have included participation in a 1966 assassination attempt against Somoza and a 1969 attempt to free from a Costa Rican jail FSLN founder and leader Carlos Fonseca (who was killed in 1976). During the rescue attempt, Ortega was wounded and taken prisoner; he lost the use of his right hand and has only partial use of his left hand. He is widely known as the principal stategist of the insurrection that overthrew Somoza in July 1979. Because he was a leader of that insurrection, he holds the honorary rank of commandante de la revolución (commander of the revolution). He is a leader of the Tercerista Faction of the FSLN.

During the past several years, Ortega has visited Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Cuba, the USSR, Algeria, and countries in Eastern Europe. He is about 43 years old. He is married. His brother Daniel is President of Nicaragua and also serves on the FSLN National Directorate. Another brother, Camilo, was killed in a battle with Somoza's National Guard.

LUIS CARRION CRUZ (PHONETIC: CAHREEOHN)

Member, National Directorate, Sandinista National Liberation Front (since March 1979).

Addressed as: Comandante Carrión.

Luis Carrión has been a member of the National Directorate, the decisionmaking body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), since its inception in March 1979. Press reports indicate that he has sometimes been the directorate's spokesman in dialogues with non-Sandinista groups in the country. Since late 1984 he has been involved in talks about cease-fire proposals with Indian opposition leader Brooklyn Rivera. He has also served since April 1980 as Vice Minister of Interior and has Cabinet rank. Carrión has publicly criticized US policy toward Central America, especially this country's military support to Honduras. In a speech in February 1982 he repeated charges that the US Government had a $19 million plan to destabilize Nicaragua, and he linked the plan to a bombing that month at Sandino Airport. In an interview published the following July, he stated that "The war with the counterrevolutionaries" had begun. He blamed the increase in counterrevolutionary operations in his country on activities of the US Government, Latin American mercenaries, and the Honduran military.

Carrión is the son of a businessman and banker. He was active in FSLN activities at the National Autonomous University of Nicaragua during the late 1960s. In 1970 he joined a rural guerrilla command. He became vice commander of the Sandinista People's Army in August 1979. He is a member of the Proletariat Faction of the FSLN. During December 1979-April 1980 he was Vice Minister of Defense. Because he was a leader of the insurrection that brought the FLSN to power, he holds the honorary rank of commandante de la revolución (commander of the revolution).

Carrión, who is about 33, is married to the former Patricia Lacayo. A brother, Carlos, is the national coordinator of the 19 July Sandinista Youth. A sister, Gloria, is a former secretary general of the Sandinista Women's Organization. A cousin, Javier, is a commander in the Sandinista Popular Army.

VÍCTOR TIRADO LÓPEZ (PHONETIC: TEERAHDAH)

Member, National Directorate, Sandinista National Liberation Front (since March 1979).

Addressed as: Comandante Tirado.

As a member of the nine-man National Directorate, Víctor Tirado belongs to the decisionmaking body of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN). In a reorganization of the FSLN in September 1980, Tirado, who has served as a member of the Executive Commission of the FSLN National Directorate and as chairman of the State Committee of the FSLN National Secretariat, was transferred to the Department of Organization and Mass Work and placed in charge of labor activities. During February-September 1980 he also served as coordinator of the State and Military Commissions of the National Directorate. At the opening session of a seminar on Marxist political economy in Managua in February 1983, Tirado discussed the links between Marxism and the Sandinista revolution. He affirmed that Marxism was the basic component of the ideology of the revolution and said that without both Sandino and Marx, the revolution would not have been possible.

Tirado has frequently criticized the policies of the United States. In January 1985 he stated that "Reagan's policy is not eternal. It will collapse any time because it represents a mistake, not only for the United States but for the world capitalist system . . . the imperialist policy toward Nicaragua and other backward countries is a terrorist policy aimed at destroying our economic independence through financial embargoes or military aggression. In a speech in February 1982, Tirado accused the US Government of complicity in a bomb explosion in Sandino Airport that month.

Tirado was born in Rosario, Mexico. He first came in contact with Nicaraguan Sandinistas in Mexico in 1961 and has participated in FSLN activities since then. He was a friend and companion of FSLN founder Carlos Fonseca Amador, who was killed in 1976. According to the Mexican press, Tirado was a member of the Communist Party of Mexico during the early and mid-1960s. Other press reports state that he participated in guerrilla activities in northern Nicaragua throughout the 1970s and for a long time lived and worked with the peasants in that area. Because he was a leader of the insurrection that brought the Sandinistas to power, he holds the honorary rank of comandante de la revolución (Commander of the revolution). Moreover, the Nicaraguan Government of National Reconstruction granted him citizenship in September 1979 in recognition of his important role in the revolution. He is a member of the Tercerista Faction of the FSLN. Since the FSLN came to power, Tirado, 45, has visited Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, Syria, Poland, East Germany, Vietnam, and the United States.

TOMÁS BORGE MARTÍNEZ (PHONETIC: BORHAY)

Minister of Interior (since July 1979).

Addressed as: Mr. Minister.

Tomás Borge is the last surviving member of the trio that founded the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN) in 1961. He serves as a member of its National Directorate, a nine-man group that plans and directs the party's activities. As Interior Minister, he is in charge of the police and internal security apparatus. He often uses the police to intimidate and control dissenters. Borge also serves on the Defense and Security Committee of the FSLN and is assistant commander in chief (the third highest post) of the Sandinista People's Army. He is dedicated to Marxism-Leninism and to the FSLN's commitment to establishing a Communist political and economic order in Nicaragua, closely aligned with the Soviet Union and Cuba. In a Playboy interview in September 1983 he stated: "I told [my mother] that I would not be blackmailed by her gentleness and her naivete and that I was a Communist." He has stated that a mixed economy can exist in Nicaragua only in the context of the revolution, "where social criteria predominate over the individual's wishes." In an interview in Le Monde Diplomatique in September 1984, he stated: "There cannot be a mixed economy here identical to the one in Venezuela or a political pluralism identical to Mexico's . . . we are Marxists."

As Minister of Interior, Borge has defended his government's human rights policies and has stated that police abuses will be corrected. In addition, he has criticized the Nicaraguan private sector, claiming that businessmen were guilty of "genocide" against the common man and responsible for the social and cultural backwardness of the people. He has further criticized political activism in the private sector. Borge has been critical of US policy toward Central America, claiming, for example, that the administration of President Ronald Reagan has used the possible threat of the installation of Soviet missiles in Nicaragua to justify giving US military aid to Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua anti-Sandinistas. US Drug Enforcement Agency investigations in 1983-84 implicated a Nicaraguan who reportedly had close ties to Borge in narcotics trafficking.

Borge studied law at the National University of León. He was jailed from 1956 until 1958 for student activism. Imprisoned again in 1976, he was released and flown to Panama in August 1978 as one of a group of FSLN prisoners exchanged for more than 1,000 hostages held by the Sandinistas in Managua's National Palace. Borge is the leader of the Popular Prolonged War (GPP) faction of the FSLN. During the struggle against President Anastasio Somoza in the 1970s, the GPP attracted a following of students and other youths who declared their belief in Cuban-style guerrilla warfare as a way to overthrow the regime. Because he was a leader of the insurrection against Somoza, he holds the honorary rank of comandante de la revolución (commander of the revolution).

Borge, 55, has been married at least twice. A wife was murdered by the Nicaraguan National Guard in July 1979.

PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF TERRITORIAL EXEMPTION

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

Mr. DE LUGO. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we are a great nation, but sometimes we can do some unwise things.

I received in my office yesterday an excellent letter from my good friend, JAIME FUSTER, the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico. Copies of this letter with the attachment were sent to all Members of Congress. I want to urge all Members of the House to take a moment to read the letter from the Resident Commissioner and the attachment, an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 11 of this year, written by Norman Ture, who, from 1981 to 1982, was the Under Secretary of Tax and Economic Affairs in the Department of the Treasury.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is an American success story in the highly volatile and important Caribbean. The success came about through "Operation Bootstrap" which is based on section 936 of the Tax Code, the so-called territorial exemption.

Now, under the Treasury tax simplification proposal, they want to do away with section 936. This section 936 provision is the basis of an American success story, the transformation of a poverty-stricken island in the Caribbean into a prosperous island community that all Americans can be proud of. I hope that my friends will read this letter and think very carefully before taking action which could be disastrous for Puerto Rico and extremely harmful to the best interest of our country.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 1985.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Congress may soon be faced with some hard choices regarding tax simplification measures. One of them, a matter of vital importance to the 3.5 million American citizens of Puerto Rico which I represent, is the elimination of Section 936 of the IRS Code, better known as the "territorial exemption" slated for extinction by the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Needless to say the people and Government of Puerto Rico are opposed to that proposal which would substantially escalate the already dismal unemployment situation in the island, officially estimated at 23% of the labor force right now. The repeal of Section 936 will cause severe economic and social hardships in Puerto Rico while producing no appreciable revenue gains and a significant net revenue loss for the U.S. Treasury. It would also undermine the United States security interests in the political stability of the Caribbean region and place an onerous strain on U.S.-P.R. relations. Both Puerto Rico and the United States have a big stake in forestalling the economic chaos that could ensue in an island proud of its long term association with the United States.

Norman Ture has contributed an enlightening article to the debate on Section 936 entitled "Treasury Prepares a Caribbean Austerity Initiative" published in *The Wall Street Journal* of April 11, 1985. I share it with you on the reverse of this letter in the hope that you will agree with us that the elimination of Section 936 from the Tax Code would be untimely, very detrimental to the U.S., and, as Ture says:". . . repealing a useful tax provision is hardly the best way to simplify it. . . ."

Cordially,

JAIME B. FUSTER,
Member of Congress.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 11, 1985]

TREASURY PREPARES A CARIBBEAN AUSTERITY INITIATIVE

(By Norman B. Ture)

A Treasury Department official once calculated on the back of an envelope what the "cost" was of not applying the corporate income tax to Puerto Rican subsidiaries of mainland corporations. It went like this: You figure out what the corporations would pay if they had to pay the tax and, of course, nothing else changed. You assume, that is, that the plant would still be in Puerto Rico, or at least in territory subject to U.S. taxes. Then you divide this number by the number of Puerto Ricans on the payrolls of these plants. You find that it's "cheaper" to give the Puerto Ricans more food stamps.

Ever since this idiot calculation was first made, the Internal Revenue Service has been gunning for Section 936 of the IRS code, the possessions corporation tax credit.

Under this provision, affiliates of U.S. mainland companies engaged in business in a U.S. possession, chiefly in Puerto Rico, may claim a credit against their federal income-tax liabilities with respect to the income produced by these affiliates in the possession. Coupled with the tax holidays granted by Puerto Rico under Operation Bootstrap, qualifying possessions corporations are substantially free of Income tax on their possessions source income. The Treasury Department's tax-reform proposal wants to repeal the Section 936 tax credit because it believes that the current possessions corporations tax system is complex, expensive and inefficient.

The complexity in the possessions corporations provision is, of course, primarily of the Treasury's own making. Treasury is to be commended for acknowledging this complexity, but repealing a useful tax provision is hardly the best way to simplify it. The charge that the credit is expensive and ineffective is based on the Treasury's gross overestimate of the tax revenue it forgoes because of the credit and an equally gross underestimate of the number of jobs that result from the operations of possession corporations in response to the Section 936 credit.

The Treasury Department, not willing to give the Puerto Ricans cold turkey, acknowledges that repeal of the credit will cause disruptions in the possessions, particularly in Puerto Rico. It proposes, therefore, to replace the present Section 936 credit with a "wage credit" that, it asserts, will be more cost-effective.

The Treasury Department is wrong.

The so-called wage credit would be a fixed dollar amount per hour worked by all people employed in the possession by an establishment engaged in manufacturing. This amount would be 60% of the minimum wage applicable to such employees in the first year—1987, decreasing by 10% a year beginning in 1993 until it is completely phased out in 1998. The credit would apply against the federal income-tax liability on the possession source profits of the company. For this reason, it is obviously wrong to treat the wage credit as a subsidy for employment. The credit would reduce the tax on profits, not on wages. It would, therefore, reduce the cost of using capital, although not to anywhere near the same extent as the present credit. It would not reduce the cost of labor.

The proposed wage credit is nothing more than a severe cutback in the existing Section 936 credit. As such, it would do little to reduce complexity, and it certainly would not be more effective in promoting employment. And unless one relies on the Treasury's implicit assumption of inert, non-responsive taxpayers, it won't produce any of the revenue gains so extravagantly estimated by the Treasury Department.

Far more is at stake than merely the tax purity, tidiness or revenue gains that the Treasury presumably is seeking by repeal of Section 936. The combination of Puerto Rican tax holidays and the Section 936 tax exemptions induced a flood of new business investment and business ventures into Puerto Rico from 1948 until the mid-1970s. The resulting expansion of production, employment and income transformed the Puerto Rican economy from a dismally unproductive agricultural society into a highly advanced industrial economy. It has made the Puerto Rican economy the model for economic development and growth orginating in the private sector.

When the Reagan administration was seeking to develop a Caribbean Basin Initiative emphasizing the private sector's responsibility for development and growth generating activity, it could have done no better than to implement a Section 936 approach. Instead, the Treasury successfully pushed for highly punitive limitations on Section 936 that were included in the 1982 tax increase. The Puerto Rican economy, which had been faltering since the late 1970s as a result of IRS efforts to cancel the tax exemption afforded by Section 936, was stunned; it has yet to share in the mainland's economic recovery. Repeal of Section 936 as the Treasury proposes would be a devastating blow to the island's economy and might well send it tumbing back toward its pre-1948 status as the poorhouse of the Caribbean.

Even if the Treasury and Congress were to be unconcerned about these economic consequences, they would have to be concerned about the enormous increases in relief outlays of various sorts that the federal government would have to make attempt to relieve the Puerto Ricans' economic distress. The results would be a significantly greater fiscal burden on the federal government and a far poorer, less productive Puerto Rico in which the unemployment rate would attain unthinkable levels.

As serious as these distressing outcomes would be, they do not tell the entire story. The geopolitical consequences of pulling the rug out from under the Puerto Rican economy should be recognized. Only the most naive believer in the beneficent intentions of Fidel Castro would believe that a Puerto Rico in economic collapse would not entice Cuba to try to foment revolution on the island.

For the Treasury and Congress to consider repealing Section 936 without providing

equally effective incentives would not only be unfair but would utterly erode the credibility of U.S. efforts to promote economic development and progress throughout the Caribbean and Latin America.

(Mr. Ture is president of the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation. From 1981-82 he was undersecretary for tax and economic affairs in the Treasury Department.)

LEGISLATION MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO THE RETIREMENT EQUITY ACT OF 1984

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

● Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation making technical corrections to the Retirement Equity Act of 1984. This bill would make technical, clerical, conforming, and clarifying amendments to provisions of both the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, which were amended by the Retirement Equity Act of 1984. While most of the amendments would be effective as if included in the Retirement Equity Act or are prospective, there is one amendment which is effective as of the date of introduction of this bill. Specifically, that provision would require spousal consent for using plan assets as security for loans, effective for loans made after the date of introduction.

The bill has been prepared by the staffs of the Committee on Ways and Means, Committee on Education and Labor, Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, and the Joint Committee on Taxation, with valuable assistance from the Treasury Department. The Committee on Ways and Means intends to hold early hearings on this bill. It is my hope that interested members of the public will carefully review the introduced legislation and bring to the committee's attention any additional corrections which are truly technical in nature. As with H.R. 1800, the Technical Corrections Act of 1985, the standard for determining whether an amendment is technical will be quite rigorous. This legislation is not intended to be the vehicle for any substantive changes to the act.

A summary of the amendments made by the bill follows:

SUMMARY

A. MINIMUM PARTICIPATION, VESTING, AND BENEFIT ACCRUAL STANDARDS

Break-in service rules

The bill generally conforms the break in service standards applicable to class year plans to the break in service rules added by the Act. Thus, under the bill, a class year plan generally must provide that a participant's rights to benefits derived from employer contributions for any plan year are nonforfeitable not later than the close of the fifth "plan year of service" following the plan year for which such contribution was made. If the participant incurs five consecutive one-year breaks in service before the completion of five plan years of service following the year for which a contribution was made, the participant's rights to any contributions for such year may be forfeited.

In addition, the bill makes conforming changes to the rules governing the taxation of certain lump sum distributions. Under the bill, in determining whether any distribution payable on account of separation from service is a lump sum distribution, the balance to the credit of the employee is to be determined without taking into account any increase in vesting that may occur if the employee is reemployed. However, if an employee is reemployed and the vested interest in the amount of pre-break benefits subsequently increases, making the prior distribution ineligible for lump sum treatment, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue regulations to recapture the reduction in tax attributable to the prior election to treat the distribution as a lump sum eligible for the special 10-year income averaging tax treatment.

Maximum age requirement

The bill reduces from 25 to 21 the maximum age requirement that a simplified employee pension (SEP) may impose as a condition of plan participation. Thus, a SEP may not require, as a condition of participation, attainment of an age greater than 21 or the performance of services for three of the immediately preceding five calendar years (whichever occurs later).

B. SURVIVOR BENEFIT REQUIREMENTS

Coordination between qualified joint and survivor annuity and qualified preretirement survivor annuity

The bill provides that a qualified joint and survivor annuity is to be provided in the case of a married participant who does not die before the annuity starting date unless the benefit is waived in favor of another benefit. Accordingly, under the bill, the qualified preretirement survivor annuity rules apply in the case of death before the annuity starting date and the qualified joint and survivor annuity rules apply in the case of death on or after the annuity starting date.

Transferee plan rules

The bill includes two provisions relating to the transferee plan rule of the Act. First, the bill clarifies that the transferee plan rule does not apply with respect to transfers made before January 1, 1985. In addition, the bill clarifies that if separate accounts are properly maintained for the transferred assets and investment yield attributable to those assets, then the transferee plan rule applies only with respect to the transferred assets, rather than the entire assets, of the plan with respect to the participant for whom the transfer was made.

Qualified preretirement survivor annuity in case of terminated vested participant

The bill clarifies that, in the case of a participant who separates from service prior to death, the amount of the qualified preretirement survivor annuity is to be calculated by using the actual date of separation from service, rather than the date of death.

Spousal consent requirements

Under the bill, a spouse's consent to waive a qualified joint and survivor annuity or a qualified preretirement survivor annuity is not valid unless the consent (1) names a designated beneficiary who will receive any survivor benefits under the plan or (2) acknowledges that the spouse is relinquishing all rights to name a designated beneficiary. If the consent names a designated beneficiary, the beneficiary designation is not to be changed subsequently without the spouse's consent.

In addition, the bill provides that a plan is to provide that no portion of the accrued benefit of a participant may be used as security for any loan unless the participant's spouse (determined at the time of the loan) consents to the use of the accrued benefit as security. This rule overrides all of the qualified joint and survivor and qualified preretirement survivor annuity rules, including the rules that a spouse's consent is valid only with respect to that spouse.

The provision relating to spousal consents for beneficiary designations is effective for consents given after the date of enactment of the bill. The provision relating to accrued benefits pledged as security for a loan is effective for loans made after the date of introduction of the bill.

Notice requirement for individuals hired after age 35

The bill provides that the period for giving notice of the right to waive a qualified preretirement survivor annuity is a reasonable period after the date of hire in the case of a participant hired after age 35.

C. QUALIFIED DOMESTIC RELATIONS ORDERS

Tax treatment of divorce distributions

The bill provides that the Act's special rules for determining the taxability of benefits subject to a qualified domestic relations order apply only to distributions made to an alternate payee who is the spouse or the former spouse of the participant. Thus, distributions to a spouse or former spouse generally will be taxed to the spouse. However, with respect to distributions made to any other alternate payee (such as a child of the participant), the participant generally will be required to include the amount of the distributions in gross income.

Determination by plan administrator

The bill makes it clear that the 18-month period during which benefits may be deferred begins with the date on which payment would, but for the deferral, be required to commence.

Coordination with qualified domestic relations orders

In addition, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue such regulations as may be necessary to otherwise coordinate the provisions affecting qualified domestic relations orders (sec. 401(a)(13)(B) and sec. 414 (p)) with the overall qualification requirements. The Secretary of Labor has authority to issue regulations under the qualified domestic relations order provisions of ERISA and Sec. 401(a)(13)(B) and sec. 414(p) of the Code, and the bill does not affect the authority of the Secretary of Labor to prescribe such regulations.

Coordination with qualified plan requirements

The bill makes it clear that a plan is not treated as failing to satisfy the qualification requirements of the Internal Revenue Code, which prohibit payment of benefits prior to termination of employment, solely because the plan makes payment to the alternate payee, even if such payments are made prior to the date at which the participant would have attained the earliest retirement age under the plan. This exception applies, how-

ever, only if the present value of the benefit to be paid to an alternate payee does not exceed $3,500.

D. NOTICE OF ROLLOVER TREATMENT

The bill clarifies that a plan administrator is required to provide notice to plan participants of eligibility to roll over plan distributions when any eligible rollover distribution is made, including a distribution of amounts eligible for rollover treatment pursuant to the partial rollover rules.

E. EFFECTIVE DATES

The bill clarifies the application of the transition rule relating to qualified preretirement survivor benefits in situations in which the participant had designated a beneficiary other than the participant's spouse. Thus, under the bill, the total death benefits payable to any beneficiary with respect to an individual who (1) performs at least one hour of service under the plan after the date of enactment of the Act, (2) dies before the annuity starting date, and (3) dies before the effective date of the Act, is to be reduced by the amount payable to the participant's surviving spouse pursuant to the transition rule.

However, the bill also permits the surviving spouse to waive the right to receive any qualified preretirement survivor benefit, provided such waiver is made on or before the close of the first plan year to which the Act applies. Such waiver is not to be treated as a transfer for purposes of Federal gift taxes or as a prohibited assignment or alienation for purposes of ERISA or the Code.●

COMMEMORATING THE LIBERATION OF THE NAZI DEATH CAMPS

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] later on this afternoon has reserved time for a special order to commemorate the liberation of the Nazi death camps at the end of World War II, 40 years ago, just about this time.

I had intended to participate in that special order and I wanted to commend the gentleman for having taken the time to do so. Unfortunately, because of my schedule, I will not be able to stay for that. So I wanted to just take a few minutes to make special note of my joining in the commemoration of the liberation of those death camps.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman SOLARZ, for convening today's special order in remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Nazi death camps—as well as the anniversary of the defeat of Hitler's Germany. On this anniversary, we must remember and honor the 6 million Jews who died in those camps, along with the millions of others who fought against the Nazi nightmare which nearly engulfed Europe and the world.

George Santayaha cautioned that "Those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it." To recall the suffering of a generation of European Jews is not an effort to revive Germany's sense of guilt, but a reminder to the world of this tragic period in its history. To resurrect from the now empty gas chambers of Auschwitz and Buchenwald the memories of millions who lost their lives there 40 years ago is to insure against others suffering similar fates.

The Holocaust cannot—indeed, it must not—be put behind us. Neither Jews, many of whom lost close relatives at the hands of the Nazis, nor non-Jews, who also died in Hitler's death camps, can afford to forget.

We are all responsible for remembering that it was Germany, the most civilized of all Western societies, that unleashed upon Europe a moral barbarism that had not been seen on such a wholesale scale for centuries. We must recall that Hitler's final solution, which in 4 years resulted in the deaths of 6 million Jews, was intended to exterminate an entire culture and race of people. And we must not forget that the Nazis could not have killed so many, for so long if, it had not been for the hatred stirred by centuries of anti-Semitism in Germany and the rest of Europe.

Today, the ghost of Nazism has reappeared in the guise of a school of historical revisionists, who claim that the mass gassing of Jews did not occur at the Dachau and Buchenwald camps. Others lobby against the valiant efforts of organizations such as the U.S. Office of Special Investigations which labors to find and prosecute Nazi war criminals.

To halt the resurgence of anti-Semitism and other forms of hatred, we must keep alive our history, however painful it may be. Our remembering the horror of the Holocaust enables us to renew our commitment to preventing future genocides.

Earlier today during the noon hour we had occasion to have celebrated under the auspices of the National Council on the Holocaust, a celebration or commemoration ceremony in the Rotunda of this Capitol Building of the 40th anniversary of the liberation; and there were magnificent statements and speeches made, outstanding among which were a statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the statement by the distinguished scholar and survivor of the Nazi concentration camps, Mr. Elie Weisel, who is the chair of the Holocaust Council.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add some few words of personal history in noting this anniversary date.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those fortunate ones who was not counted among the 6 million Jews who were killed during World War II because I, together with my mother and sister, was able to come to the United States and we arrived here on March 12 of 1938.

I and my family, of course, will be enternally grateful for the shelter and refuge which we received from the United States, and for the rest of my days I will hope to conduct myself in such a fashion as to demonstrate my undying appreciation of the safe harbor and refuge which we were granted, as were literally tens of thousands of others prior to and succeeding the Second World War.

The date on which I arrived, on March 12, was significant because the very day before, March 11, 1938, was, in essence, the beginning of the Nazi invasion and accretion of the rest of Europe. It was the day of the Anschluss when Hitler marched into Austria to merge Germany with Austria.

The Jews of Hungary, which is where my family lived and where I came from, survived intact until some time in April 1944, again almost to the day 39 years ago, and on the eve of Passover the Eichmann forces and insistence could no longer be resisted and those Jews living on the outskirts, that is not in the central area of Budapest, were herded up and taken to the various camps.

Among the people who were taken who ultimately perished were my grandparents on both sides of my parents, that is, paternal and maternal grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, the vast bulk of my family.

I think that it is worth noting at this time each year the occurrence of that bestial act by the Nazis resulting in the death not only of my family but, as I say, 6 million Jews, countless millions of other nationalities, gypsies, Czechoslovaks, Ukrainians, Romanians, Poles, Christian, and Jew alike.

It is to be hoped that my commemorating that event we will keep the memory of that evil alive so that we can learn from it and make sure that it does not happen again.

I am hopeful that discussions ongoing right now among the President's party, the advance party, as to what would be appropriate for him to do, that in fact he will seek and find the time to visit one of those exconcentration campsites, and that if he pays honor to any of those who died during the Second World War in the military force that he will do so to those who were not part of the SS, who were the executioners of the Jews and others who died in those concentration camps during the Second World War.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1550

EILEEN GARDNER SHOULD BE REMOVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LONG). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I speak for my uncle who walks with a limp resulting from childhood polio. For my administrative assistant's son who is hearing impaired and for my press secretary's son who is blind. I speak for one of my campaign volunteers who has lived her life in a wheelchair and for the director of a veterans group in my district who has only one arm. I speak for a friend's mentally retarded child. Today I speak for those who are without sight and sound, without full mobility or full intellectual capacity but who are full of life and feeling.

Today I speak to those in the administration who have placed Eileen Marie Gardner in a position in the Department of Education where she has found a wider audience for her unfortunate prejudices against the handicapped. Her views did not begin with her; unhappily they will not end with her. She speaks an age-old narrowness which has the capability to demean every American whose arbitrary distinctions—sex, race, age, ethnic heritage and/or handicap—fit into her twisted beliefs about equality, justice and spiritual capacity.

We need not give her or her views credibility by giving her a forum by which to espouse them. She very simply preaches bigotry and we are surely not blind enough to assume those views stop with those who are handicapped. History show us those views have a way of spreading to other groups. Today I speak for those who recognize how such views can—if embraced by the majority—undermine the very fabric of our democracy.

She should be removed from her position.●

INTRODUCTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEBT REDUCTION ACT OF 1985

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

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to impose a temporary, declining surcharge on all imports coming into the United States. Imposition of a surcharge as I am proposing it will reduce the serious twin deficit problem facing our economy—that of the Federal budget deficit and trade deficit.

If substantial deficit reduction action is not taken, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that our Federal budget deficit will exceed $215 billion in fiscal year 1986. Our trade deficit is expected to exceed $140 billion during the 1985 calendar year. These two deficits pose a threat to our capacity to sustain economic growth.

It is clear that we are living on borrowed time. We are financing our budget deficit with increasing amounts of foreign capital. The United States has become a net debtor country this year. By 1990, we will owe other nations of the world an unprecedented $1 trillion. This is more than the combined debt of all the developing countries today.

One of the chief underlying causes of our escalating trade deficit is our budget deficit. The large Federal budget deficit is keeping real interest rates at historic highs, which as I stated is attracting foreign capital to finance these Federal deficits. The large flows of capital into the United States are keeping the value of the dollar on international exchange markets abnormally inflated and certainly out of reasonable balance with other major currencies. This makes it very difficult for U.S. exporters to compete abroad and makes it very easy for foreigners to export to the United States.

If we can deal with our budget deficit, progress on reducing our trade deficit will follow. The surcharge I am proposing is aimed primarily at reducing the Federal deficit. If adopted, my proposal, will enable us to get our budget deficit down under $100 billion by fiscal year 1987. If combined with $40 billion of other deficit reduction measures, the surcharge could yield a total of $80 billion or more in deficit reduction measures during fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987. Such a significant deficit reduction would lessen interest rates, and help bring the value of the dollar down on international currency markets, which in turn would result in improvement in the U.S. trade deficit.

The surcharge would be a 2 year, temporary, declining fee on all imports coming into the United States. The rate of the surcharge for the first 8 months would be 20 percent, 15 percent for the second 8 months, and 10 percent for the third 8-month period. Imposition of the surcharge would be conditioned upon enactment of at least $40 billion in other deficit reduction measures in fiscal year 1986 and a similar amount in fiscal year 1987. The only modification to the imposition of the surcharge would be for lesser developed countries who are experiencing serious balance of payments problems. The President would be granted authority to decrease the surcharge to one-half the proposal's rate for these countries upon a finding that these countries' markets are reasonably open to U.S. products.

We cannot realistically expect to sustain the current economic recovery indefinitely. If the United States heads into another recession with a $200 billion Federal deficit and our very high external debt, we could experience an economic shock of unprecedented proportions. Under those circumstances, reducing budget deficits and restoring economic growth could prove very difficult.

We must act now to substantially reduce these Federal deficits. I have examined the strengths and weaknesses of imposition of a surcharge for many months. I am convinced that the major criticisms of a surcharge given our grave fiscal problems should not disuade us from moving forward with one. In addition, I have tried to fashion my proposal to address the major criticisms.

There is a fear that the surcharge would be highly inflationary. While undoubtedly it will have some modest inflationary impact, I believe less than 1 percent of the CPI, the 2 year, temporary nature of my surcharge helps mitigate the inflationary impact. A minimum amount of import substitution is likely to take place as long as it is understood to be a temporary measure. In addition, realizing it is a temporary measure, many foreign producers will have to absorb a good portion of the surcharge from their inflated profit margins to protect their market shares in the United States. As their currencies have depreciated in relation to the dollar, prices of imports have not been reduced appreciably. Foreign firms have plenty of absorption capacity. Therefore, prices will not be significantly raised by this measure.

Others fear that foreign governments would retaliate against the United States if a surcharge is imposed. I believe foreign governments are unlikely to do so if they understand that the surcharge is temporary and aimed at correcting the serious macroeconomic misalignment. Exchange rate imbalances adversely affect foreign economies by draining their investment capital. Moreover, the United States is the largest market for our trading partners, so they have more to lose than the United States from substantial retaliation. They will come to realize that the surcharge, while adding a tariff, still keeps the U.S. market open to their products, unlike more stringent protectionist measures being threatened today.

Finally, the surcharge I am proposing is consistent with the general agreements on tariffs and trade and in fact historically has been used by many countries, including the United States, to address serious balance of payments problems. In 1971, President Nixon imposed a 5-month 10-percent surcharge on imports into the United States as part of an effort to deal with U.S. balance of payments problems. Article XII of the GATT specifically grants a contracting party the right to impose certain trade restraints in order to safeguard its external financial position and its balance of payments.

In normal times, I would not be proposing a surcharge. But these are not normal times. The prospect of $200 billion budget deficits and $140 billion trade deficits spells disaster for the American economy. With this type of massive debt hanging over our heads, sustained economic recovery is simply not possible.

The future of our agricultural and industrial economy is at stake in how we address our twin deficit problem. The bottom line is jobs. We need econmic growth to sustain acceptable levels of employment. If the United States continues to accumulate public debt at a rate of more than one-half trillion dollars over the next 4 years, our present prosperity and future improvement in our standard of living will be seriously threatened. What if our foreign lenders suddenly decide to call their demand loans? The value of the dollar could fall precipitously, interest rates would skyrocket, and another serious recession will surely follow. Unless we significantly change our present course, there wil be no soft landing.

The bold proposal contained in this legislation will lead to sound U.S. fiscal policy and stimulate economic growth through lower interest rates. It will be a strong signal that America means business. It will contribute to our competitiveness and improve prospects for long-term economic prosperity.●

SALUTE TO WALTER TROTTER

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

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Members of the House of Representatives to join with me in congratulating Mr. Walter Trotter on his retirement after 10 very successful years as chief of the Big Sur Volunteer Fire Brigade. I know the people of the Bug Sur area join with me in thanking Chief Trotter for a decade of dedicated service.

In 1974 Walter Trotter helped form the Big Sur Volunteer Fire Brigade, becoming its first chief and the driving force behind the brigade's survival. I understand that there had never been a structure fire in Big Sur that did not result in the complete destruction of the building before the founding of the Volunteer Fire Brigade. Chief Trotter has played a vital role in the fire fighting effort in every major fire in the Big Sur area in the last 10 years.

Over the last decade under Walter Trotter's leadership, the brigade has responded to over 137 fire calls, including the disastrous Marble Cone fire. Chief Trotter is responsible for the brigade's position today as a nonprofit, tax exempt corporation with an annual budget of some $25,000 being supplied solely by donations and community fundraising events. The donated funds are used to maintain the fire fighting equipment Chief Trotter has managed to acquire from public agencies over the years, and to insure that the volunteer brigade members receive the courses they require in fire suppression, first aid, and basic life support and fire prevention.

In addition to his duties as chief of the Volunteer Fire Brigade, Walter Trotter has actively served as a member of the Big Sur Rescue Team and the Big Sur ambulance crew. He has volunteered his time to respond to emergency calls when accidents occur or when vehicles and/or people go over the steep cliffs along California Highway 1.

On Saturday, April 20, friends and members of the Big Sur Volunteer Fire Brigade are gathering to honor Walter Trotter on the event of his retirement as chief. In recognition of his dedication and his contributions to the Big Sur area, I would like to add my commendation to Chief Trotter and I know that my colleagues will join me in thanking him for his commitment and in extending to him our heartfelt congratulations on his retirement. Walter Trotter has left a deep imprint on Big Sur and on the Volunteer Fire Brigade. I want to wish him the very best in all his future endeavors.●

NICARAGUAN LABOR: ANOTHER VIEW

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

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, In January, the AFL-CIO circulated a report prepared by its American Institute for Free Labor Development [AIFLD] which charged that the Sandinista Government in Nicaragua was harassing independent unions there and repressing the workers' right to organize, bargain, and strike. The AIFLD report gave a chronological listing of alleged violations and oppressive acts to support its contentions.

The conclusions in the AIFLD report have not been challenged by a delegation of labor lawyers who visited Nicaragua in order to investigate first-hand the specific accusations made in the AIFLD reports. The delegation, which was sponsored by the National Lawyers' Guild and was composed of nine attorneys who represented a variety of trade unions, declared the AIFLD report to be "a grossly inaccurate and misleading document."

In its 62-page response to the AIFLD report, the lawyers' group urged the AFL-CIO to retract the "flawed document" and to reconsider its position on the status of organized labor in Nicaragua in support of the Nicaraguan guerillas.

So that my colleagues may be better informed on this important issue, I am inserting for their reading the introductory and concluding remarks sections of the lawyers' report which is entitled, "Are Nicaragua's Trade Unions Free?"

ARE NICARAGUA'S TRADE UNIONS FREE?

(A Response To The American Institute For Free Labor Development (AFL-CIO) Report, "Nicaragua, A Revolution Betrayed: Free Labor Persecuted")

I. INTRODUCTION

A. THE AFL-CIO'S POSITION ON NICARAGUA

In 1983, the AFL-CIO Executive Council adopted a resolution stating its position on developments in Nicaragua since the July 1979 overthrow of Somoza. The resolution claims that the Sandinista Government "has become dominated by totalitarian elements which have established a dictatorship that all but destroyed the right to strike, to organize, or to bargain collectively without interference" and condemns the "betrayal of the Nicaraguan revolution by the Sandinista Government."

The AFL-CIO position is based on a report prepared by William Doherty. Executive Director of the American Institute for Free Labor Development, an AFL-CIO affiliated organization charged with promoting the development of trade unions in Latin America.[1]

The report, entitled, "Nicaragua, a Revolution Betrayed: Free Labor Persecuted" purports to explain, "in detail how the Sandinista government has all but destroyed the free trade unions in Nicaragua."

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland sent a copy of this document to AFL-CIO affiliates on April 10, 1984, describing it as a "historical as well as a current documentary proof of the beginnings of the destruction of the free trade unions in Nicaragua." Kirkland explained that the report was begin distributed in order to help union members "deal with the campaign of disinformtion which has been undertaken by the government of Nicaragua and their representatives and supporters in different parts of the world and, especially here in the United States."

On February 28, 1985, Senator David Durenberger (R.-Minn.) inserted this report into the Congressional Record, declaring that it "documents in stark detail the Sandinista's efforts to destroy independent labor organizations within Nicaragua."[2]

The twelve page report consists of 29 separate allegations of government repression of Nicaraguan trade unions by arresting union members in retaliation for their union activities; discriminatorily enforcing Nicaraguan labor laws in favor of pro-government trade unions; and staging violent attacks against union facilities and members.

The National Lawyer's Guild, a 58 year old organization of lawyers and legal workers with a long history of support for the rights of organized labor both in the United States and abroad, was concerned about the serious allegations contained in this report. On December 4, 1984, a Guild sponsored delegation of labor law practioners visited Nicaragua in order to investigate first-hand the specific accusations contained in this report as well as the general conditions faced by organized labor in Nicaragua. The

Footnotes at end of article.

delegation consisted of three employees of the National Labor Relations Board and six attorneys who represent a variety of unions, including many affiliated with the AFL-CIO.[3]

The delegation set its agenda with the cooperation of the Nicaraguan Jurist Association, an independent lawyer's organization. During its ten day stay, the delegation discussed this report and the role of trade unions in Nicaragua with officials in the Labor Ministry,[4] Justice Ministry,[5] Judiciary,[6] industrial, farmworkers,[7] teachers,[8] and health care workers unions,[9] newspaper editors,[10] community and women's groups, and rank and file workers at the Victoria Brewery and the recently constructed TIMAL sugar refinery. The delegation also met with representatives of the two primary opposition trade unions which the AFL-CIO report claims are the target of government repression, the AFL-CIO affiliated Confederation of Trade Unions (CUS)[11] and the Nicarguan Workers Confederation (CTN).[12]

In addition, the delegation reviewed allegations of mistreatment which CUS and CTN brought to the attention of the International Labor Organization, Amnesty International, and the America's Watch Committee. The Labor Ministry provided a written response to the AFL-CIO report, with attached documentation.

This report discusses the delegation's findings.[13] It begins with a brief description of the history and structure of the Nicaraguan labor movement and the impact of the civil war against the U.S. backed counter-revolutionary guerrillas (*contras*) on organized labor. The next section provides a point-by-point analysis of the accusations made in the AIFLD report. The report concludes with a summary of the achievements of the Nicaraguan labor movement since 1979.

B. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. The leadership and many members of the two Nicarguan trade unions supported by the AFL-CIO have close ties with counter-revolutionary guerrilla groups which have committed numerous atrocities in violation of international law.

2. Virtually every claim of trade union repression made in the AIFLD report is disputed by representatives of CUS and CTN, by respected human rights groups, or by credible evidence provided by the Nicaraguan government. The delegation urges union members to demand that this fundamentally flawed report be retracted and that the AFL-CIO reconsider its position on the status of organized labor in Nicaragua.

3. The Nicaraguan labor movement has enjoyed a rapid growth since 1979 and has achieved significant gains for Nicaraguan workers.

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS ABOUT THE AIFLD REPORT

Our investigation of the AIFLD report revealed significant disputes with regard to virtually every allegation of trade union repression in Nicaragua. The AFL-CIO's accusations were directly contradicted by CTN and CUS leaders with whom we met, reports of respected international human rights groups, and documentary evidence provided to the delegation by the Labor Ministry.

Thus, for example, CTN leader Huembes flatly denied the AFL-CIO's allegation that Sandinista troops occupied and shot-up the union's headquarters. A document prepared by the CTN concerning alleged mistreatment of its members by the Government from 1980 to 1984 made no reference whatsoever to the arrest of 40 CTN members during the months of March and April 1982, as alleged in the AIFLD report.

Moreover, many of the allegations contained in the AIFLD report were dismissed by ILO report based on a detailed investigation conducted by an ILO representative in December 1983. For instance, contrary to the AIFLD report, the ILO found that the Port Workers Union of Corinto at no point "formally announced" that it was leaving the CST to affiliate with CUS. Instead, the ILO found that in May 1983 these dock workers voted overwhelmingly to remain with the CST. In addition, the CTN admitted to the ILO that no less than 17 CTN members which it claimed were arrested for their union activities were in fact arrested for engaging in illegal activities on behalf of the contras, such as economic sabotage.

Documents provided to us by the Labor Ministry also directly contradicted numerous AFL-CIO allegations. For example, a report submitted to the Government by CUS official indicated that the Chinandega Transport Union was never affiliated to the CST, as alleged by the AIFLD report, but was always a CUS affiliate.

Finally, our investigation revealed numerous examples of exaggerated and possibly fraudulent accusations of Government repression made by CUS and the CTN to the ILO and other human rights organizations. Thus, CUS leader Guthrie claimed both to the ILO and to the delegation that the Nicaraguan Supreme Court deliberately refused to issue a decision concerning the recognition of a CUS affiliate at the San Antonio Sugar Mill, which in fact had been issued in January 1984. The ILO dismissed numerous CTN allegations that its members were arrested when the CTN was unable to document them. Further, the delegation has reason to believe that the CTN may have fabricated an allegation that 18 of its members were arrested in May or June of 1983, which it reported to Amnesty International and America's Watch.

As a result of these numerous conflicts between what the delegation believes to be credible and reputable sources and the AIFLD Report, the delegation concludes that what AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland says is a "historical, as well as current documentary proof of the beginnings of the destruction of free trade unions in Nicaragua" is a grossly inaccurate and misleading document.

The delegation is deeply disturbed that the AFL-CIO has permitted this fundamentally flawed document to be used by the Reagan Administration in its campaign to seek congressional approval of funds to assist the Contras in their efforts to violently overthrow the democratic government of Nicaragua.

The delegation urges all principled trade unionists to demand that the report be retracted and that the AFL-CIO vigorously oppose the resumption of U.S. aid to the Contras.●

FOOTNOTES

[1] The AIFLD receives most of its funding from the U.S. Government through Agency for International Development and private business groups. The Reagan Administration recently appropriated funds to AIFLD through the Caribbean Basin Initiative. AIFLD has been accused of involvement with various CIA activities in Latin America, including the U.S. invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, and the military coup in Chile during 1973. *See* Phillip Agee, *Inside the Company: A CIA Diary* (New York: Stonehill Publishing Company, 1981) (P. 64); Jack Scott, *Yankee Unions, Go Home!* (Vancouver, B.C.: New Start Books Ltd., 1978) (pp. 223-226).

[2] The Congressional Record (February 28, 1985, S. 235-55).

[3] All delegation members participated in their individual capacity and not as representatives of any government agency or trade union.

[4] Labor Minister, Benedicto Meneses, Labor Judge, Manuel Cano, Director of Employment, Rene Rivera, Director General, Labor Ministry, Rene Cruz, Treasury of Ministry, Ricardo Montalban, Director of Conciliation, Dena Aleman Mena, Inspector General of Labor, Francisco Ordonia, Director of Labor Organizations, Jose Lopez.

[5] General Secretary of Justice, Carmen Lopez, Criminal Prosecutor, Omar Cortez.

[6] Supreme Court Justice, Mariano Barahona Portocarrero, and Judge Humberto Obregon Aguirre.

[7] Napoleon Loasiga, Secretary of Labor and Social Relations.

[8] Edgardo Garcia, Association of Farm Workers, Political Secretary and General Secretary of the Nicaraguan Trade Union Coordinating Council, Denis Melendez, Secretary of Political Education, Sandinista Workers Confederation, and Marcos Gonzales, attorney for Agricultural Producers Union (an association of small and medium sized landowners).

[9] Dr. Gustavo Porras, Secretary General, Ires Montenegro, Secretary of Political Education, and Dr. Rosalino Cheve, attorney.

[10] Daniel Martinez, Editor of *La Barricada*, and Xavier Chamorro Cardenal, publisher of *El Nuevo Diario*.

[11] Avin Guthrie, Secretary General, and Jose Espinoza, Political Secretary.

[12] Carlos Huembes, Secretary General, and Eugeno Mendrano and Jose Altamirano.

[13] After the delegation returned from Nicaragua, AIFLD issued a supplemental report, titled "The Sandinistas And The Workers—The Betrayal Continues," containing four additional allegations of government harrassment of trade union activity during 1984. This report does not discuss these new allegations except for one concerning the strike at the Victoria Brewery which we visited.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. MAVIS HURT

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I speak today in tribute to and in memory of a longtime friend of mine, Mrs. Mavis Hurt of Kirksey, KY, who died on February 27 of this year at the age of 87.

Mavis McCuiston Hurt was the daughter of the late Thomas Montie McCuiston and Flo Hamlin McCuiston. A native of Calloway County, KY, she was a respected and influential lady in Murray—the county seat—in Kirksey, a small town near Murray, and throughout western Kentucky. I believe it is a tribute to her memory that a scholarship fund in behalf of Mavis and her husband Max B. Hurt has been established at Murray State University.

Mavis and Max Hurt were married 64 years, an accomplishment that is certainly rare these days. Mavis Hurt was a member of the Kirksey United Methodist Church and was active in her community. If all people were as devoted to and conscientious about our country and our future as Mrs. Mavis Hurt, America would be an even better place in which to live.

In addition to her husband Max—a highly respected and influential Calloway countian in his own right—Mavis is survived by her daughter,

Mrs. Van (Geraldine) Dunn of Delaware, OH; her grandson, Dr. Max Gilbert Dunn of Charlottesville, VA; three granddaughters, Mrs. Steven (Susan) Hoffius of Charleston, SC, Mrs. Randy (Sheila) Rutledge of Seattle, WA, and Mrs. Saul (Joan) Solomon of New York, NY; and one great-granddaughter, Annie Hoffius.

Also surviving are four sisters, Mrs. Newell (Esther) Doores of Kirksey, KY, Mrs. Lola Morgan and Mrs. Sonny (Hilda) Parkhill, both of Hazel, KY, and Mrs. Norvie (Ruth) Riley of Mayfield, KY. Three surviving brothers are Rupert McCuiston of Kirksey, State Senator Pat McCuiston of Pembroke, KY, and Macon McCuiston of Nashville, TN.

My wife Carol and I extend our sympathy to the family of this outstanding Kentuckian who was an inspiration to those of us who knew her.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, I say that I continue with my advice to the privileged orders. This time, very much right in line with Joel Barlow, the one who coined that phrase, and used that approach at the time of the American Revolution, where he served as a chaplain in George Washington's revolutionary army.

Let us never forget that that was the name of our fighting men; they were rebels; they were revolutionaries in the true sense of the word. The American Revolution was indeed an indigenous, a native, a civil war so to speak, and we had the essential decisions to make then, and Joel Barlow, who was also an outstanding poet, who wrote a great epic poem in which, peering into the future he visualized this great contest between what he called the two gods.

He entitled it: "The Olympiad." In it, he visualized what he called the sons of the god Hestor or the black race, in the struggle ultimately to develop because of their then-continuing enslavement by the white.

He was that kind of a mind, but he was also a true revolutionary. He joined Tom Payne the great revolutionary radical pamphleteer. As a matter of fact, if I were to extract some paragraphs from Tom Payne's basic writings and just date them today, they would be attributed to what everybody calls a radical socialist thinker in this day and time.

So that those most revolutionary words, in the Preamble of the Constitution, that did not appear until oh, more than 10 years after the point, were actually those that were inspired by men like Joel Barlow and Tom Payne.

They felt so keenly that they went to Europe to foster revolution. It was Joel Barlow's advice to the privileged orders of Europe for the need for revolutionary change.

So my advice, in the series of special orders, along two basic lines that I think are fundamental at this point in which we have yet to reaffirm and rededicate ourselves to the form of government we enjoy and have attained such high privileges of freedom under the Constitution of the United States, whose 200th anniversary remains yet to be celebrated in 1989.

The common opinion is that we had our bicentennial in 1976. That was just the bicentennial of the struggle that won our independence, but it was not until 1789, the adoption of the Constitution, and the convocation of the First Congress on March 4, 1789 in New York City, in which spelled out in word and in deed were the basics in what we call our system of government in America.

It was most revolutionary, as evidenced by the first few sentences in the preamble in which reference was made to where true sovereignty, where the true power; is.

Now this was most revolutionary then because the whole world was governed by kings or czars or potentates who said that their sovereignty; that is, power, came from God. Well, you could not go any higher that that. Even though the people really never ever said that, this is what kings had maintained for centuries, and which ruled the world in its entirety, no matter what part of the globe; until the Americans came and said, No, all power comes from the people.

So that in the preamble, we read: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union * * *" I think these words ought to be inscribed, and that the preamble ought to be memorized by every single American citizen, from school child to adult, because they are still highly revolutionary; radical, if you please.

You talk to all the wielders of power today, you will find out why it is that the American people have been usurped in their power to control their destiny with respect to such vital things as their economic well-being, because the power and control of the people through their representatives, whether they are legislative policy-making body representatives or Presidential or Executive representatives; the President and the Vice President.

Up to 1974, 1975, it would have never been thought possible that the United States would end up with an unelected President and two unelected Vice Presidents. In fact, this was the most horrible possibility that the men who wrote the Constitution could think of.

So the Constitution was constructed in such a way, and after much debate. Remember that the first 10 years of our national existence, they thought so little of such an office as the Presidency which, during the debates in the Constitutional Convention, they referred to as the "chief magistrate," not President.

They thought so little of that office that they provided no such thing during the first 10 years of our national existence as a national entity.

The First Continental, the Second Continental Congress, the Articles of Confederation—that is the last thing they wanted, because they were still very much fearful of that all-powerful potentate, and they wanted to make sure that that startling revolutionary concept, that power came not from an individual who in turn said he got it from God, but it came from the people.

Then that basic, basic division of human thought as to government from the very beginning of human history, the two basic philosophies: The one that says that unless you have some superkind of men, an elite, a special genius kind that knows more and has a better idea than anybody else of what is good for the people.

You have that thinking. You have it today, throughout the world; and then you have the other, upon which ours is predicated. And that is, very simply, that in the long haul, the people themselves know best what is better for them. That yes, in the short run they will make very disorderly mistakes, but that in the long run they know best and better.

□ 1600

Then the rest followed—the great system of education, based on the fact that unless we had an enlightened citizenry, in the words of Thomas Mann, that we could not expect to have self-government without it eventually dissolving, as the few experiences in past human history had demonstrated amply, into an oligarchical or an authoritative or anything but a self-government on the part of the people.

We are still predicating our basic faith and philosophy on the fact that the overwhelming majority of the American people do know what is best for them if they are informed, if they are knowledgeable, and that, second, the processes of democracy are not neat, they are not mathematically correct and orderly, that, yes, that is the difference between a unitary or an authoritative single-person government. You do not have to waste time with debate, you do not have to hear 535 different individuals. And this is also the reason why at this point in the 20th century we have more need than ever to have the advice to the privileged orders that Barlow so much an-

ticipating an age in which the 3 million, or so, that constituted the population of the Thirteen Colonies would ultimately be a grand, grand realm, a vast realm, and the principles upon which this meager beginning were so securely founded were so great and so true and so much the fruit of the distilled wisdom of centuries that there could be no course but one of steady progress and evolution of self-government or democracy.

And it has happened. But in order for that to have happened we had to have this other thing that has been so unique, and still is, to the American system—that is, up until lately—and that is what we call our public school system, the idea that no American, no matter what his economic or any other social position, that if motivated and equipped with the zeal and the desire and the ambition to gain knowledge, to gain in the ability to lead a rich and rewarding life, a productive life, a creative life, that his education would not be denied because of either class status or economic inability.

But just 100 years ago, for example, we still had the vestiges of the indenture system. You read the deed records in Shelby County, TN, in the other counties in Kentucky, and to this day you look and see, "Sheriff's notice: Failure to serve because GTT," gone to Texas.

Well, what was the sheriff serving? He was serving summons on an individual because he had jumped his indenture.

What was an indenture? An indenture was a contract by which one American indentured himself to another for a period of time, glad to be able to be given a chance to work, no wages, no nothing, not a property owner. Almost 100 percent of the jurisdictions, if not 100 percent of the jurisdictions, did not have universal suffrage. In the first place, women could not vote.

I might remind my colleagues that women in my State of Texas did not have the right to vote until 1919, after World War I. But on top of that, if you were not a property owner, you could not vote either. And this was a vestige that lasted in many of our States, including Texas, until as late as the decades of the 1940's. And our concept of universal manhood suffrage has really blossomed in such a way that it is unknown in any other realm. But it does no good to have that free access to the ballot box that so many Americans have given life, blood, property, and all of their possessions in order that we could have that right if we are economically in serfdom. If we are not free economically, it does not matter if we are relatively free politically. And this is a point where I think it is appropriate to remind my colleagues and others in the privileged orders of our country that time is upon us. Why? As I have pointed out in my three preceding discussions, we have, ironically, turned full cycle in just 4 years, just 4 years. This little delicate flower of democracy is very delicate. It has to be nurtured. We have to work at it. Democracy is a very lonely activity in the world today. Even in the countries that we call democracies and allies, I want my fellow Congressmen and all the citizens in this country to have a chance to go live in those countries and see the difference.

But this is what is at stake today: Whether or not we in our time will continue to provide the basis for economic equality, economic freedom, without the loss of the basic freedoms such as the price that has been paid in other modern day structured governments, whether it was under what we call an oligarchical or a corporate or a Fascist state or the other side of the metal, a socialistic or a true socialistic government or communistic government—it all depends on what you define the terms as to what we are talking about. But in the structured nature of those governments we do not have the basic essence that we take for granted when we define a democracy, and that is that no government is at sufferance to exist except and until it has the just consent of the governed.

Now, in the last few years, when it comes to our dealings with other parts of the world, including that in the new world that we share with about 21 republics or countries, we lose sight of that. We are not talking about that. We are talking about something else. And so when we use the word "democracy," it can be variously used in these other countries to fit their cultural acclamation or understanding of that word. As an example: What good does it do to have the right to go vote if the citizen has a lack of knowledge as to the issues involved.

Example one: Last year we had a Presidential election year. What were the issues? How were they discussed? One of the basic issues, I would think, would have been the horrendous real threat not only to the economic well-being of our country, which has already suffered because of it, but for the world itself, given the interdependence and the interplay between the economic lives in each one of these countries today, the so-called international accounts deficit, the so-called trade deficit.

In the United States as of December 31 we ended up with over $139 billion deficit. Now, we can piddle around, as I have said ad nauseam, with our so-called domestic deficit for a couple years more, maybe—unless this other impinges a little more drastically and quickly than some of our whistlers in the dark seem to think—but we cannot tolerate any kind of an imbalance of that nature, given the structured economy of the American system and the way we perform our economic activities.

Why is that? Because for every $110 billion of that $140 billion deficit, we have lost forever one-quarter of a million American jobs permanently. So I have read into the RECORD—I am not going to repeat it today—some of the things that are happening now in which our fundamental economic activities, even the funding of basic research and development in the two areas in which the tremendous push for jobs and job creation exists in the so-called space communication world, which the United States had the lead in before 4 years ago, and the so-called robotics.

□ 1610

What do we find? We find that whatever research and development is being performed in our universities and other places in the United States, they have to go to Japan and France for allocations of credit to conduct them. France has taken the lead in robotics; it is also stealing our bacon in the contest for contracts on space communications as of today. So is Japan.

There has to be a cause, and, of course, there is. But nobody wants to be interested in debating that. So last year, when everybody knew, at mid-year, at the end of that quarter, that the imbalance in our trade deficiency was so great that even if we tried to stabilize it as of September 1 at the end of the year, we would have a horrendous deficit, and that it has dire, immediate implications. I had been speaking since 1965 on that fact that that was a grave potential then; that it looked to me as if we were going to face such rising costs in interest, for example, which in turn are like an impact of the steel ball games that you see that bounce one against the other in sort of an inertial collision that keeps almost a perpetual motion. This is the way these activities have rebounded.

Essentially, that formula was well known to us because it was used successfully by the debtor nations after World War I, in which Americans and Uncle Sam were outwardly ridiculed as "Uncle Sap."

I am going to read at this point from a book that I have had since I was 14 years of age in the middle of the beginning of the disastrous Depression. From that book I am going to select excerpts, and some of them, in view of the President's recent utterances about saying at firest he would not visit, he would not visit Buchenwald because it would hurt the sensibilities of the German people, and it would revive old memories.

Here are a few, and I think they are very pertinent to what is happening today with the President, finally, after the great outcry, and even despite that says, well, I will not go to Buchenwald, but I will go to the cemetery where the German soldiers died who were actually burning the fires in the ovens that were cremating people, and were also doing a few other things that were a threat to liberty to every single country in the world.

The same thing happened after World War I. Soon after, when it became apparent as a result of the Treaty of Versailles, that the United States was the only creditor nation. If American credit had not been available, World War I would not have lasted 6 months for the Allies.

The same thing happened in World War II; we were the only creditor nation. Now, as of 4 years, we are a debtor nation. Now, what does that mean? What it means is exactly what it meant after 1930. I remember as a child, I remember, I have total recall, and though I visibly understood some things, I remember the headlines. The Treaty of Lucarno, where we will have some kind of understanding. The moratorium proposed by Herbert Hoover because of the inability of the debtor nations to pay us their debts, and they in turn, getting their money to pay their debts to us from the German reparations which the Germans soon, soon began to disclaim against and protest.

Here is an example of what was being said in 1932. The great August Crisis of 1932. This is from German publications:

> The war has lasted 16 years. German guilt was a lie. The Treaty of Versailles is a great crime of modern history. Reparations are tribute. In 1917, America joined the Allies against Germany because then her money was on that side. Among nations, the debtor is dear to the creditor. The Hoover Debt Holiday Plan in 1931 was to protect 2 billions of American money in Germany, for now America is bound by what Germany owes here to be Germany's political friend.

Well, we had the same scenario; different countries because some of the countries that existed up to after World War I disappeared in the interim, and certainly after World War II. We did the same thing.

We talk about the process that I give to Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, that great financial wizard, they called him. Hitler's wizard, who was able to get some of our principal corporations to actively finance Adolf Hitler.

Now how did that happen? Well, the same way it is happening now. All debtor nations were going to meet their foreign obligations from a favorable balance of trade. Now that sounds familiar. Japan says, hey, wait a while. Sure, we have a favorable balance of trade right now with you, but we will have a depression if we do not have access to your markets. And we say, hey, but wait awhile.

We did not say that until this year, but you will not let our goods in there. Now, England, for years our aircraft manufacturers could not be allowed to compete in England because England had certain standards that were constructed in such a way that the American manufacturers could not meet. It is the same thing with American-made cars in Japan. The standards of acceptance were of such a nature that they could not qualify American cars for importation.

We have blindly, for a mess of potage, sold out America's heritage. So all debtor nations, and remember that America was the only creditor nation in both wars, were going to meet their foreign obligations from a favorable balance of trade. A nation's favorable balance of trade is from selling more than it buys. Was it possible for nations to sell to one another more than they bought from one another? So that everyone should have a favorable balance of trade? By lending one another the credit to buy one another's goods, that would be the way. All nations would not be able to lend equally, of course; each would lend accordingly to its means.

Where is the profit in trade for the sake of which you must lend your customers the money to buy the goods? The answer was, but unless we lend them the money to buy our goods, they cannot buy them at all. Then what should we do with our surplus? As it appeared that European nations were using enormous sums of American credit to increase the power of the industrial equipment parallel to our own.

This is what we did during and after the Marshall plan. All with intent to produce a great surplus of competitive goods to be sold in foreign trade. Another question was sometimes asked: Are we not lending American credit to increase Europe's exportable surplus of things similar to those of which we have ourselves an increase in surplus to sell?

□ 1620

Is it not true that with American credit, we are assisting our competitors to advance themselves against American goods in the markets of the world? The answer was, of course that is so. You must remember that these nations you speak of as competitors are to be regarded as our debtors. They owe us a great deal of money. Unless we lend them the credit to increase their power of surplus production for exports, they will never be able to pay us their debt.

Lingering doubts, if any, concerning the place at which a creditor nation might expect to come out were resolved by an eminent German mind, with its racial gift to subdue by logic all the difficult implications of a grand illusion. That was Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, formerly head of the German Reichsbank. He was speaking in this country what I have just said. For creditor nations, principally this one, he reserved the business of lending credit through an international bank to the backward peoples of the world for the purpose of moving them to buy American radios and German dyes.

By this argument, for endless world prosperity, as a product of unlimited credit bestowed upon foreign trade, we loaned billions of American credit to our debtors, to our competitors, to our customers, with some beginning toward the backward people. We loaned credit to Germany, who loaned credit to Russia—at that time, Russia was a developing nation; it was still sunk in peasantry—for the purpose of enabling Russia to buy German things, including German chemicals.

Well, now, let us see. Talk about modern days. The Russians decided, after commercial consultation with the Western countries of Europe, that they could provide gas for Europe, which would enable Europe to be free of its dependence on that Middle East oil, but also free of America, because interest rates that we, in this country, have so blithely imposed and have crucified our businessmen and our average families with an extortionate rate of credit and interest—extortionate, usurious. As I have pointed out, even 7,000 years before Christ, they were passing laws against usury. So here we are, blitheful Americans, thinking that you can have extortionate, usurious rates of interest and can continue free so-called business. Of course you cannot. You cannot continue this other.

But let us look at this gas pipeline. President Reagan said, "Hey, look, we are not going to let those Russians do this, so I admonish you West Germans and Frenchmen and in between, you better not have anything to do with it."

So they said, "Hey, wait a while, though. The pipe, the knowhow, much of the equipment has been supplied by your businessmen. All we want is a piece of the action and we also want to have gas. We want to have natural gas delivered to our doors so that we can really increase our commercial potential, the well-being of our people, increase the level of the standard of living, and you certainly do not want to stand in the way of that."

President Reagan said, "Well, I am going to insist, and we might even consider some kind of an embargo."

Then they really got down to business, as they are going to get next month at the economic summit meeting in Bonn, Germany, and all of a sudden, you are going to start hearing

a little bit more about the ECU, the European Currency Unit, and the EMF, the European Monetary Fund. You have not heard anybody but myself even mention those terms in this Congress on either side of the Capitol, but I say to you, my friends, and my colleagues, you soon will be, but it will be too late. It will be just like after the Hoover moratorium, too late, too late, and after having drained the American people of its lifeblood in the allocation of credit against all the warnings of the greatest leaders our Nation has had since the initial period of history—Thomas Jefferson telling us in plain words, "It will be worse than having a standing army in the country if you allow the bankers to take over the credit allocation of this country, to decide for you what is good for you in credit allocation."

We had the same warning from President Jackson in the 1830's, and then later, almost a week before he died, Abraham Lincoln saying in almost the same words the same thing except that he went one step further and predicted the greatest tide of corporate corruption that would be invading this country and taking over. And it did, for it was less than 10 years after his death that we had the smelly corruption, the Grant administration, and infecting our Congresses for the first time, having quite numerous expulsions and bills to expel Members for corruption, the Crédit Mobilier scandal, and all that kind of stuff. All of this President Lincoln foresaw, and warned against.

And then came the big bust of 1907-08, the great travail throughout the land, for the same basic reasons, the overweening, greedy grasp for power to allocate credit resources where the country's needs were not being met. The country was burgeoning. Little businessmen wanted to go West. The country was expanding, but not its allocation of credit, because that was being tied up by the great speculators, and finally you had the bust of 1907-08.

Then you had a great travail in the Congress and you finally got the so-called Pujo committee. This was a House committee, and it led to finally, 5 years later, the enactment in 1913 of the Federal Reserve Act and what has happened is that we have come full circle. We have undone all of the basic congressional intention in the passage of the Federal Reserve Board Act. There is not a man among us here who will tell me that the Federal Reserve is not a Federal agency. You will say, "Of course it is." I say to you, as I have for years, it is not. It is more of a private entity than a public one. Yet it is to them that you, my colleagues, have abdicated the constitutional responsibility of coining money and allocating the credit of this Nation. You have allocated and you have abdicated and you have given it to the most greedy interest ever known to man.

Certainly they are unaccountable. The Federal Reserve Board does not account to you. I can tell you that. I have been a member of the Banking Committee since I came here 24 years ago. I have seen five or six different Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board. Not once did any one of them come up to offer an accountability. What is more, the real power, which is in the so-called Open Market Committee, who are they? Do they have to come before you, the American people, and your representatives? They do not. They think that is foolish. They ridicule it like one of the Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board, who contemptuously looked up after I asked a question during my 5-minute period, and said, "Well, what do you want to do? Do you want the politicians to run the banks?"

In other words, the people, through their representatives, are quite unfit to determine their economic well-being. And here is the Federal Reserve Board, a creature of the Congress. It is not something that came down from on high, as John Adams referred to George Washington, booted, spurred, ready to ride on the hapless backs of mankind, sent from heaven to do so.

□ 1630

It is responsible under the law and under the intent of Congress, but it is not now. As I have said repeatedly—and I ask you to do it now—get a dollar bill out of your pocket, and you will see if it does not say, "Federal Reserve Note," not "Treasury Note." Yet the law says that the Federal Reserve Board shall be the fiscal agent of the U.S. Treasury, not the master but the agent.

But which one of you would join me in trying to recall that responsibility and accountabilility that the Congress, in enacting the Federal Reserve Board Act of 1913, really mandated? Which one of you will join me?

I have been putting in a bill to do that since 1965. I have been putting a bill in there to abolish the Open Market Committee. You know, England and the exchequer did that until some time after World War II when freeborn Englishmen were not going to allow it, but it was in the power of the exchequer to guarantee the building up or the downfall of any government. And it is the same thing today. Yes, as long as there have been Republican chairmen and as long as there have been these powerful bankers, the Rockefellers and the others from the First City National Bank, and these great panjandrums of power who certainly are not mindful of the greatest interest of the greatest number of Americans.

And what is pitiable is that these men have again failed because of their inability to compete with these minds over in Europe that have 400 years of experience, whether it is the gold merchants or the silversmiths there or in Zurich, where we have been so vulnerable to the fickle foreign investor that, for the first time in our history, when that fickle foreign money man loses a little faith and pulls his money out of the Continental Illinois Bank and causes a collapse, we nationalize a bank.

This is a measure, my friends, that I believe, and in a manner that I know, would require under the law the Federal Reserve Board to come to this Congress for authorization, but it has been allowed to do that and put $6 billion of the taxpayers' money in there in order to nationalize and take over the Continental Illinois.

Now, how many more can the resources stand? And the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told me—it is in the record, too, in the proceedings of the hearings we had some 6 years ago—he told me to my face. He said, "Absolutely, we will stop at nothing. We will use all of the resources"—meaning resources of the country—"in order to save those banks."

And they have done what? The same thing they did, and others with them at that time, the Wall Street bond dealers. After World War I, they just took money from good hardworking Americans and put it in German Government bonds and in Imperial Japanese Government bonds. To mature when? In 20 years. That was 1921. Well, we got the maturity payment with Pearl Harbor.

And in Europe, our credit was used. When they could not pay back our debts with our own money, then they just repudiated the whole deal. And what happended then?

Well, let us continue because the gas pipeline construction—incidentally, the gas pipeline was completed. We did not hear one peep from President Reagan or anybody else. But what is the story? Well, the pipeline company is known as Ruhrgas, named after its basin, Ruhr. But it is principally owned by Exxon, Mobil, and the British. But in turn, Exxon and Mobil are controlled by Chase Manhattan and the First City National, so they were not about to let Ronnie Reagan mess up a good deal.

It is as David Rockefeller said on the trip back after the Polish bank crisis. We might have been hearing a lot about the freedom fighters in Poland and Solidarity, but the real issue was the $20 billion that those German, American, and British banks wanted to make sure they would not lose—at least not too much of it. And they could not care less. And David Rockefeller, coming back on the plane, was interviewed and he said, "Well, of course there are some Communist

countries that we can do and we must do business with."

Well, I remember, preceding the 1941 bombing, a lot of businessmen and, in fact, General Electric and some of the big American corporations that were actively and directly financing Adolf Hitler, said, "We can do business with Hitler." In fact, it took the famous Walter Winchell to say it. I will never forget it because I heard him on the radio when he said it.

We had the great hero, Charles Lindbergh, who made a trip and went to Germany. The Fuehrer gave him the Iron Cross, and he came back and he said, "There is nothing that can resist Germany. I visited decadent England and France, and they have nothing. That German Luftwaffe is invincible." And Walter Winchell came out one night and he said, "To all those who say that America cannot be invaded, I appeal to them to ask our Native American Indians." I remember that because it was a one-liner that caused a lot of ripple at that time.

But here we are in the 1980's, and we see the same principle, German credit involved in the pipeline with future freedom from the United States.

Yesterday in the RECORD, I put a little news item from the Dallas Times Herald in which it was said that Chairman Volcker went to Germany about a month ago, and he said, "Hey! you fellows, you've got to do something. We are now depending on you because you are coming in and you are invading American markets in such ways."

Well, of course, I gave those statistics in the first Advice to the Privileged Orders, about how the Japanese banks are supporting the University of Virginia in vital research. They had to go to Japan to get the line of credit. Why? Because they can get a line of credit from 9 percent or less, whereas here at their bank in Virginia, they could not get it for less than 15—not less than 14½ percent or 15 percent.

Why can the Japanese do that? Because in Japan there is no such thing as having any legal ability to charge anymore than 9 percent interest, but the average conventional interest is 7 percent or less.

So all of that has a cause and effect, as I have vainly been trying to point out since I wrote a letter to President Lyndon Johnson. Certainly no one can accuse me of having been partisan. The President then bucked it over to an underling in Treasury and ignored it, and then I became very critical. Nobody accused me of being partisan then. In fact, I guess I had about as much attention then as I am getting nowadays.

So I continue the reading. Remember, this is 1932.

For several years there was ecstasy in the foreign trade. All the statistical curves representing world prosperity rose like serpents rampant.

In fact, I told one of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board that if they had a coat of arms, I would suggest a serpent rampant.

Result: Much more debt, a worldwide collapse in foreign trade, prostration of the statistical serpent, credit representing many hundreds of millions of labor days locked up in idle industrial equipment both here as well as in Europe. It is idle because people cannot afford to buy its products at prices which will enable industry to pay interest on its debt. Yet you will be almost persuaded that tariff barriers as such were the ruin of foreign trade, not credit, inflation, not the absurdity of attempting by credit to create a total of international exports greater than the sum of international imports so that every country should have a favorable balance out of which to pay its debts, but only this stupid way of people, all wanting to sell without buying.

□ 1640

Well, if we just change the dates, I think we can say that we have come full circle and we can go back and America can find itself as it was in its beginnings in the colonial era back in the mercantile system where we were the consumer dumping ground of the products. We no longer are the producer as of 4 years ago. From a producing nation we are now a consuming nation and a dumping ground. The German imports have risen in just a period of three-fourths of a year last year about 33 percent. The same with some of the French, not counting the Japanese; but what is more insidious is that the other day we had a hearing of the subcommittee of the illustrious gentleman that asked a while ago that I yield, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. CARROLL HUBBARD, his subcommittee of which I am the ranking member as well and the Banking Committee on Oversight.

I asked one of the regulators from the Comptroller's Office, because now they are beginning to get concerned after the fact, and I asked him, I said, "What is the volume of foreign financial involvement, and he said, "Gosh, I don't know."

I said, "Well, can you find out for me?"

He said, "Well, I'll try."

Now, for years I had been asking the various Chairmen of the Federal Reserve Board, but mostly the years beginning with 1971 and thereafter, what was the volume of incursion into such activities as banking of foreign interests from Arab to Japanese?

Finally, I had to go out from the Department of Commerce, because the Federal Reserve Board said they could not give me that statistic, and from the annual Federal Reserve Board reports, I extrapolated from some of their graphs and statistical tables in the Department of Commerce and in the Comptroller of the Currency, but even then it was a very conservative amount.

In New York alone, in the banking there, 25 percent of the short-term deposits were Arabic. In 1979 I rose here on this House floor after fruitlessly trying to get the committee and the committee chairman then to call hearings on this and also the contemporaneous phenomena of the main banks of our country lending in a period of 1½ years from $3 billion to $47 billion of their credit resources to nations that anybody studying their national ledgers would know did not have the ability to pay; so that today the nine principal banks of this country have such an overhang of bad loans in these countries that they exceed 100 percent of the capitalization structure of these banks.

Now, if this would have happened to a local bank back home, it would have been declared illiquid or under some kind of governmental regulatory control, if not completely closed; so that these are the things that my advice to the privileged orders, that is, we are in need of vast revolutionary change and this is my advice to the privileged orders that have been in power for more than 300 years south of the border, who have callously, cruelly, tortured, imposed tyranny, exploited, and debased their own citizens, continuing today.

It hurts my soul to see this great American leader forsaking the most precious element of all that the world looks to, moral leadership, and substituting for that worship before the false bitch goddess of war our destinies. It is folly. It is a calculated course for disaster, but it is also tied in with this other generalized program.

It also is part and parcel of the calamitous results of the misperceptions that our leaders in and out of the Congress, in and out of the Oval Office, have persisted in maintaining about the real world to the south of us and the real world in Europe.

In middle Europe we have a recrudescence of ancient history, but animosities and enmities, bitter, bitter.

France, for example, is no longer in NATO. It broke off. Nobody has ever wanted to debate or even discuss why. What is the reason?

What is the tenuous hold we have on the leadership there?

We have been insisting and we started that in the 1950's in rearming Germany, West Germany. Always the bogey man has been communism, communism. Always it has been on the basis of a refusal to want to understand the reality of the world.

In Germany today on the threshold of power is a new generation that does not recall World War II, but they see 300,000 of our military there. We have changed the designation of those troops from occupation to defense, but all you have to do is read the poets, the writers, the thinkers, the journals

in Germany, like in 1932, All you have to do is read where you have strong opinions that those Silesian Germans, which they consider refugees in Germany, want to have the Silesian province now in Poland restored to Germany.

And what is the reply of the present leader, Mr. Kohl, who was 15 years of age during World War II, as well as the Russian leader, who was also his contemporary? He was 15 years of age more or less in World War II.

We have a mindset basing 315 billion dollars' worth of defense taxes on the 1945–46 Europe, not the 1984.

I say to my colleagues, that I think is an error. Even granting that I am not 100 percent correct, and I certainly do not think I am, certainly the basis upon which I am appealing for discussion is tenable and worthy of consideration.

I am basing it on these specific things that I see and I read and I know. I read those journals. I read those newspapers. I read those books and I can see and I know that if we blithely continue to ignore what that real world is south of us, if we insist on saying that we will demand democracy and ideological purity from one nation that has just barely captured freedom for itself from the most tyrannical regime known to mankind that we imposed.

The United States cannot escape that judgment. we imposed Somoza. We kept him in power. We did not care a tinker's hoot whether there was freedom or torture or not in that country all during that regime. All of a sudden we do.

Coming north to Guatemala where at this moment American bayonets are ripping open the bellies of 7-month-old Indian children that the government has practically exterminated—talk about genocide, it has happened right here south of us with our help, with our armament. There is not one Russian gun involved in the struggle in Guatemala. It is 100 percent American. We cannot say and you do not hear the President saying that Nicaragua is shipping arms to Guatemala, yet Guatemala is on the verge of blowing up.

I say to my colleagues, what more do we want to wait on? We have to develop a policy based on our ability to still resurrect the moral leadership potential that our country can and will and should assert or reassert, if it is not too late, because in the invasion of Grenada, which the President has highly touted, we violated all basic international law, including the three basic treaties we had entered into solemnly with our Western Hemisphere partners.

□ 1650

Not any longer are we amenable at this time for that moral collective leadership. But I feel that even despite the losses, despite the fact that we confess the bankruptcy of our diplomacy by resorting to military unilateral intervention, that it is still not too late, that we can, and I have offered suggestions, I have not been critical, I have offered suggestions since the President before this one and nobody could accuse me then of being partisan. Critical, yes; partisan, no. But my essence of position and advice remains the same. And what is that? To come back to the basic tenets so proudfully enunciated by Joel Barlow, that great poet, that great leader, that great American, a revolutionary, a true democratic spirit, republican government, form of government, a Democrat, and which we have so carelessly abdicated, and for a mess of pottage have traduced.

It is no wonder to me as Shakespeare said when nations become arrogant and complacent, they become enamored of their follies and errors, and they strut in their utter confusion, laughettes, that is laughed at by the world.

Let me assure you that every single nation from Canada, skipping the United States, and south of us is not with us. They are against our basic policy thrusts.

Mind you, I include Canada because of the similarity of background, origins, aspirations, institutional government, would certainly have no communistic persuasive element in their criticism of our policies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REMEMBRANCE OF THE VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

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

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, today in the beautiful rotunda of our Nation's Capitol we observed the national civic commemoration of the liberation of the Nazi death camps by the U.S. Army. And we paused to remember the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust as well as the Christians, gypsies, gays, and others who perished in the incredible death machine of the Nazi regime.

It is hard to believe that only 40 years ago our Nation's fighting men set free the few remaining victims of the death camps. Some say these events never happened—yet the veterans in the audience today were there and they shall never forget. Nor can the thousands of survivors, many of whom live in my congressional district, forget or erase the memory of that terror. Nor can anyone forget who claims to be a part of the civilized world.

Eli Weisel, the Chairman of the National Holocaust Memorial Council, has eloquently explained a fundamental truth about the Holocaust, "those who forget will be forgotten, those who remember, will be remembered".

I recently looked back at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS covering the years from 1933 to 1945, to see how often our former colleagues in these historic Halls, referred to the horrors of the Holocaust and to the Nazi death machine which developed and perfected the art of mass killing and the dehumanization of its victims. In that period, there were some 78 specific mentions of the persecution of the Jews in Nazi-controlled Europe, and at least 11 other times, when Members called attention to the incredible horrors being perpetrated against those groups or individuals who were deemed a threat to the new order being built in Germany.

Unfortunately those speeches, hearings, and resolutions were not sufficient. The killing went on, and the cries of the dying and desperate went unheeded. Our immigration policies were unchanged, and later our military plans would not be modified to even bomb the railways and prevent the deaths of thousands of more victims at places like Auschwitz.

Many claimed not to know what was happening, and what could be done to aid those in desperate need.

But today we know all too clearly what happened, and we must be determined to ensure that those who died will not be forgotten, and that those who were responsible for these artocities must bear that burden and be brought to the tribunals of justice, no matter who they may be, nor where they may try to hide.

For we who are privileged to stand in the Halls of the Congress must never forget that World War II was not simply a conflict between competing armed forces, but a fight to overcome those who were bent on world domination and the annihilation of the Jewish people. The supreme sacrifice of over 500,000 Americans in World War II demands that we, as Americans, must never forget the fundamental distinction between the friends of freedom and the forces of unspeakable evil. And that is what today's commemorative observances were all about.

Many of us in the Congress have been deeply disturbed by the President's decision to visit a cemetery next week where lie the remains of some of the Nazis who not only were responsible for the systematic slaughter of the Jews but also for the slaughter of American POW's during the Battle of the Bulge. Our veterans and those who made the supreme sacrifice in the effort to stop the slaughter and destruction of the Third Reich demand that we pay homage to these brave men and women, and to the others

who perished in and survived the Holocaust, and thus reaffirm our commitment to the sanctity of life and the value of freedom.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GONZALEZ. 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 therein extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

There was no objection.

REMEMBERING THE HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New York who is not here today, Mr. STEPHEN SOLARZ, and could not be here, but who has himself taken out a number of special orders and who organized many of us in this House to remember on this day of remembrance, this day when we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the death camps.

The years of the Holocaust did more than physically exterminate a people. It ravaged the soul of a people, extinguished all hope and trampled upon their dignity. A people's very survival hung in a precarious balance. The magnitude of the tragedy is without equal in history, but as we have seen in history, its poignancy and its underlying causes are not without parallel. The tragic encounters that comprise Jewish history culminated in the years of the Holocaust and reached a degree of such demonical depths of inhumanity, of such staggering dimensions of inflicted agony, that one reels from this encounter with history.

But remember, Mr. Speaker; remember, we must.

The systematic killing of one-third of the world's Jewish people occurred within a period of history in which the world appears to have been stricken with moral paralysis and naive indifference. This silence and this indecision by other nations and peoples at a time of such wretching inhumanity resounds through the deserted barracks, rooms, and hallways of Auschwitz, Treblinka, and Dachau along with the haunting, plaintive cries of its victims.

The United States and its people were among the ranks of those who stood by in silence and inaction. And so, Mr. Speaker, we must remember, and we must continue to remember to teach our young the lessons of history in the hope that never again shall we allow such an event to happen.

It is but a short journey from subjugation to annihilation and from indifference to acceptance. The scholar and author, Elie Wiesel, himself a survivor of the Holocaust, as a small boy enduring the horrors of the Holocaust said to his father: "If this were true, the world would not be silent." His father replied: "Perhaps the world does not know."

What his father was saying to Elie Wiesel was perhaps the explanation for the inaction and the apparent indifference of the world was their lack of knowledge. Would, Mr. Speaker, that that was true. It would be perhaps easier for all of us to live if the facts were that we did not know, and not knowing did not act.

But history is clear. History tells us again and again and again that we did know, that the messages were coming out, that the inhumanity of the Nazi regime not only toward the Jews but toward Christians, toward people who were different than the norm set by the Nazis were being systematically destroyed.

Our obligation, Mr. Speaker, is clear. We must continuously raise our voices so that they will be heard and our presence felt when the dignity of individuals in any nation is compromised.

Mr. Speaker, if I spoke an hour or 2 or 3, or 10 times 3, I would not have the ability to articulate or dramatize or make as real the horror of the Holocaust as we ought to remember it.

□ 1700

Remember it and be ever vigilant to make sure that we as individuals, we collectively as a House of Representatives and we as a nation never again stand by so that Elie Weisel hears from his father that the reason for action is perhaps "They do not know" when in fact we did.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say to my colleague and friend, STEVE SOLARZ, a fighter for the rights of all people in all parts of the world: Thank you, not only for taking this special order, not only for including the remarks of many of my colleagues, but also for giving one of the most eloquent and compelling addresses that I have had the opportunity to hear.

I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for his taking time and pausing and waiting this long on this special order. I wish the record to show that I join him wholeheartedly in his very eloquent statement and referral to the most tragic period known in human history, and to thank him once again for taking time and pausing to commemorate this sad and tragic event.

Mr. HOYER. I am particularly honored, Mr. Speaker, to hear the words of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] who has himself probably stood on this floor longer than any other Member, probably in history, to speak out on behalf of the rights of individuals, individually and collectively, and I am therefore honored by my friend from Texas, who is one of the great protectors of the civil rights and human rights of people in this body, that he would join me in my remarks and make those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this time in the RECORD the remarks made by Congressman STEPHEN J. SOLARZ of New York during the course of the ceremony in the Capitol today at 12 noon sponsored by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, entitled "Days of Remembrance."

Four decades ago, the allied armies brought to an end the most cruel and cold-blooded evil in the long history of man's inhumanity to man.

This is most assuredly a time for both remembrance and reconciliation.

But if it is incumbent upon us to mourn the victims of the Holocaust, it is not, nor can it ever be, appropriate for us to pay tribute to the villains whose service to the Nazi regime made it possible.

The Second World War was not, as perhaps we should have learned from the global conflict that preceded it, the war to end all wars. But it was the war which forever stamped the mark of Cain on the brow of man.

Now we know, as we never knew before, the depth of depravity to which the human spirit can sink.

It was not just the splitting of the atom but, even more, the institutionalization and industrialization of death, in the service of abiding racial and religious hatreds, which has created the shadow and spectre of mass destruction under which we are doomed to live for the rest of time.

There is nothing we can do to bring back to life those whose souls and spirit were snuffed out in the gas chambers and killing fields of Nazi-occupied Europe. We cannot even adequately pay homage to the courage and dignity they displayed on the altar of hate and cruelty.

But we can invest their sacrifice with a redeeming significance, if we resolve to do everything within our power to prevent such an evil from ever happening again.

In the aftermath of the Holocaust, nothing will ever be the same. The memory of the 6 million has irrevocably shaped the consciousness, if not the conscience, of mankind.

Here in our own great country, the indifference with which we once witnessed the attempted extermination of an entire people and the elimination of a flourishing civilization, has been transformed into an emerging willingness to use our influence and our resources on behalf of the noble work of rescue and relief.

Where we once rejected the St. Louis, we have welcomed the boat people.

Where we once turned our backs on the Jews of Europe, we have participated in the rescue of the Jews of Ethiopia.

Where we once were indifferent to the fate of the Jewish people, we now provide

the support which makes possible the survival of the Jewish homeland.

This is the legacy of the Holocaust.

This is the obligation of our Nation.

From their final resting place, the 6 million call upon us to never forget.

From our earthly abode, we can only respond: Never again.●

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation commemorates the 40th anniversary of the Holocaust. Ceremonies are being held here in the Capitol as well as throughout the country.

Several weeks ago, I was invited to speak to a B'nai B'rith chapter in Chicago. The occasion of the dinner was their own commemoration of the Holocaust.

This chapter has a number of members who are survivors of the Holocaust. Their evening, in contrast to the solemn occasions to be held this week, was one of celebration—a celebration of life and having survived one of the darkest periods in man's history.

I had prepared a speech to give to the nearly 400 people there, but the emotion of the evening did not lend itself to formal speeches. However, I would, for my colleagues and those others who would read it, like to have reprinted here the remarks I prepared for that evening.

I'm prepared to be a little philosophical this evening, because I've spent the last 2 days listening to New York cab drivers.

One of those cabbies was a Soviet Jew who came here 3 years ago. We talked about how he felt about America. For him everything in this country is marvelous. He's particularly proud that his daughter can speak english without an accent.

He escaped from a regime that has been practicing cultural genocide against our people for nearly 60 years.

I think the question facing the civilized world today, is how do we prevent what happened to the Armenians in Turkey, the Jews in Europe, or the Cambodians in southeast Asia, from ever happening again.

History teaches that the roots of genocide always sprout in totalitarian regimes. "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

On the other hand, democratic forms of government, with their emphasis on individual rights, obstructs the kind of discrimination that has led to the annihilation of our people.

So as American Jews, we should do everything we can to promote democracy. We should actively oppose totalitarianism and we should work to move authoritarian regimes toward democracy.

We have done the latter in El Salvador, and Argentina and we are doing the former in Nicaragua.

I cannot mention the Nicaraguan situation, without mentioning what happened there recently.

Shortly after the Sandinistas seized power from Somoza, they expelled the moderate elements from the junta; and the Marxist-Leninist faction took over. The moderates are today fighting as the Contras.

Not only have the communists brought in Cuban and Soviet advisors, but the PLO is a growing force in Nicaragua. In fact, the Venezuelan government intercepted a Libyan plane full of PLO arms, bound for Nicaragua several months ago.

The Sandinistas are so close to the PLO, that they call them their "blood brothers." Shortly after the moderates were forced out, a region of terror against the Jews in Nicaragua began. This culminated with the Sandinistas torching a temple while it was filled with Sabbath worshipers.

Today there are no Jews left in Nicaragua. They fled for their lives.

I am enormously proud that this 40th anniversary honoring the liberation of the Holocaust survivors, can be celebrated by a new group of Jewish survivors.

The leadership which the free Jewish community has shown, in conjunction with our government and that of Israel, has been responsible for the saving of 1,000's of Falashas.

While we are all aware of our governments part in airlifting the Falashas from the Sudanese Desert, there is something that happened a few months ago, that took place without much notice.

For years, the Libyan madman, Mu'ammar Qadhafi has been trying to acquire an atomic bomb. If he had that awesome power, you can be sure that he, and the PLO terrorists he is harboring would use it at the first opportunity against Israel.

Our government succeeded in persuading Belgium not to enter an agreement with Libya, to build a nuclear powerplant. That plant would have been capable of producing weapons grade plutonium.

While our international relations are important in our advocacy of democratic principals, we must also be vigilant in our own communities.

I have been deeply saddened at the growing public attention given Lewis Farakan, and the platform given Jesse Jackson. Their views cannot be accepted as legitimate public comment. But all we have to do is look at the influence they had on the Democratic Party platform, and its silence on anti-semitism, to know that their impact has been felt.

While I was deeply disappointed at that exclusion, I was pleased to have participated in the writing of the Republican plank against antisemitism.

Around the world, it is going to take Jews who live in the light of freedom, to stand up for those who do not.

Our actions do make a difference. For example when members of Congress protest to the Soviets over their treatment of refuseniks, they do listen.

Lev Elbert had his labor camp sentence reduced from 4 years to 1 year, after congressional action. I have been working for years on behalf of Lev Shapiro and his family. While they haven't yet received their visa, Lev has not been arrested as threatened. Since I introduced legislation on his behalf the intense harassment against him and his family has stopped.

We must, as free citizens, speak out for those who cannot. We must urge our government not to accept the status quo.

We must use our influence to cut off funds going to nations and organizations like Unesco that preach anti-semitism.

We must make certain that Israel continues to receive the funds and support she needs.

Most of all, we must be ever watchful, for all that is needed for evil to triumph, is for good men and women to do nothing.

Never again!●

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion of the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps, it is our duty as public servants to pay homage to the survivors of this dark period in world history. As a Jew and an active member of the Jewish community, and as one who personally suffered family losses, I strongly feel that by recalling the horror of the Jews and others killed at the hands of the Nazis, society can prevent this tragedy from ever happening again to any people.

We are the heirs of the Holocaust and the guardian of our parents' and families' painful legacy. I strongly feel that it is our duty and our obligation—yours, mine and our children's, to honor the memory and the courage of Jews who were arrested, uprooted from homes and families, imprisoned, and murdered by Nazi invaders. We must also dedicate ourselves to Judaic causes—the plight of Soviet and Ethiopian Jewry, peace in the Middle East, a safe and secure Israel, and the cases of unprosecuted Nazi war criminals.

We know the pain of remembering the Nazi genocide committed against our people. Each survivor has their own story and private nightmare. But only by recalling that sacrifice can we prevent this atrocity from happening again. Therefore, President Reagan's visit to a German military cemetery is of concern to those of us who were personally touched by the Holocaust. Reconciliation is a goal that all Americans support, but not with the price of clouding the memory of American soldiers and Jews who died in World War II.

The Jewish people need to fight the recent rise of anti-Semitism by educating present and future generations in the lessons of the Holocaust. For the first time in Florida history, the Dade and Broward secondary schools taught Holocaust studies as part of the 9th grade world history class curriculum 2 years ago. I believe in the importance of remembering and educating our children to preserve our traditions, and most importantly to remember the ghettos, the death camps, the resistance and the martyrs.

Educational endeavors to promote an understanding of the Holocaust and its implications are springing up all over the United States. A mutual understanding between the Jewish community and other ethnic and religious groups will provide an impetus to the visible expression of our commitment to the Jewish heritage: We shall never forget. One such Holocaust awareness institute is the Southeastern Florida Holocaust Memorial Center of Miami, FL, that has an unique feature—an international network of children of Jewish Holocaust survivors who are dedicated to preventing history from repeating itself. This center included an audio-video library with the testimony of survivors

which reflects the need of the U.S. Jewish community to remember. Other programs throughout the United States include; presentation by members of the clergy, academicians, professionals, Holocaust survivors, and their children—the second generation; second interfaith workshops; and third, outreach to the non-Jewish community.

Recently, the first national mass gathering of American Holocaust survivors was held in Washington to express the commitment to our heritage that we will not forget. This message should be passed from generation to generation. The survivors and their families should be commended for their efforts to preserve our traditions. I will long remember the gathering on the Capitol steps, the singing, the prayers, the joyous reunions, and the tears. The inspiration they gave me, I will pass along to my children, and they will remember.

God bless the memory of the Holocaust victims and the survivors.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], in taking this opportunity to commemorate the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps throughout Europe 40 years ago. We thank the gentleman for making this time available to us on this important occasion.

In the last century our civilization had progressed rapidly. Man began stretching the limits of his knowledge on so many horizons that it is hard to fathom that we exist in a world today that is so vastly different from what previous generations knew. At the same time, as this technology was evolving, we did not conceive that it could possibly be used for so evil a purpose as to dispose of an entire race. Today, only a few survivors remain from what was Hitler's "final solution"—a systematic, organized attempt at removing all traces of the Jewish people from the many nations of Europe. The solution came close to becoming final with 4.5 million adults and 1.5 million children perishing in the gas chambers and crematoria of Auschwitz, Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, Buchenwald, Majdanek, Treblinka, and so many other factories of death.

On this 40th anniversary of the Allied liberation of the Nazi concentration camps, commemorative ceremonies are being conducted throughout our Nation. Earlier today I joined my colleagues in the great rotunda of our Capitol to mark this solemn occasion in a national civic commemoration and to witness the bearing of the colors of the troops who liberated the camps 40 years ago. These armed forces flags will be housed in the Holocaust Memorial Museum that will be erected in our Nation's Capital near the Washington Monument.

Today's memorial activities in the rotunda were especially poignant, as we were privileged to listen to the spellbinding words of U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council Chairman, Elie Wiesel. For many years he has borne the responsibility of bearing witnesss to the the Holocaust through his many writings, and by his very existence in our midst. Although I am requesting to have his entire remarks reprinted in the RECORD, a few of his words today sum up my personal feeling—"we must invoke the past for the sake of the future."

During the ceremony, we were joined by our distinguished colleague, TOM LANTOS, with his wife and grandchildren; TOM and Annette credit their survival of the Holocaust to Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish diplomat who singlehandedly saved over 100,000 of Hungary's Jews from death in the camps. Their grandchildren are their future and ours.

We were also moved by the remarks made by our Secretary of State, George Shultz, who, in his statement, emphasized the contribution and sacrifice made by our soldiers during the course of the liberation of the camps. It is also appropriate that the Secretary's thoughts be printed as part of this special order.

Mr. Speaker, although 40 years have passed, the pain has endured. The haunting legacy left by the 6 million remains as prominent and as thought-provoking as ever. We cannot know the depth of suffering experienced by the survivors, nor the pain of discovery felt by our liberating troops. We see the newsreels and are awed by the sheer dimension of death. Yet, we were witnesses to the greatest evil man has ever perpetrated against his fellow man, and we must remember. Generations upon generations must be taught what happened 40 years ago in Europe if we are to prevent such a tragedy from ever again staining the history of mankind. We must remember, and we must state loudly and unequivocably, "never again."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I am requesting inserting of the remarks of Mr. Wiesel and Secretary of State Shultz:

REMARKS BY HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ

As the 40th anniversary of the Allied victory in Europe draws near, we in America remember not only the triumph of our soldiers and the peace-loving nations of the world, but the rescue of the Jewish people from the Nazi evil.

Every year thousands of Americans visit the memorial to the victims of the Holocaust at Yad Vashem. I myself will be going there next month. The images of Jewish suffering at Nazi hands still burn in our memories. We will never forget, and the world must never forget, the inhumanity of which mankind is capable when it disregards the sanctity, the dignity, and the human rights of all men and women. Our nation shared the grief of those who had survived the concentration camps. We mourned for those who had not. And we made one very simple pledge: Never again.

Today we are assembled to pay tribute to the American soldiers who liberated the prisoners of Nazi concentration camps toward the end of the Second World War. Nothing we say here can have much significance compared with the noble and selfless act of those American liberators. When those soldiers walked into the camps and saw the horrors wrought by Nazi fanaticism, they recognized at once the enormity of the evil they had just conquered. And they forced the world to recognize it, as well.

Never has civilization been confronted by such an unmitigated, monstrous evil as Hitler's Nazism. Never have the will and strength of the democracies been so severely challenged. Never has one people been singled out for such grievous suffering at the hands of their fellow human beings.

The rise of Nazism, and most particularly, the ruthless murder of six million Jews, together dealt an almost devastating blow to all our most fundamental hopes for the modern world. Those who prior to the war had maintained their faith in the possibility of human progress, in the idea that with high culture and high civilization would come the end of man's inhumanity to man, those who had envisioned the day when respect for the dignity, the sanctity, and the human rights of every individual on earth would be universal—all of us who shared these dreams were stunned by the Holocaust. We castigated ourselves for the world's collective failure to stop it sooner. And after the war, after the concentration camps had been liberated and the bodies of the dead had been buried, we all promised ourselves that next time it would be different. Never again would we allow a monstrous evil to go unchallenged. Never again would we appease the aggressor. Never again would we lose sight of the fundamental moral principles upon which our free society depends.

The men who liberated the camps in a sense liberated the world, as well. They put an end to the physical tragedy, though they could not put an end to the spiritual anguish. We will never forget the atrocities committed by Hitler, and we will continue to pursue the criminals who carried out his awful designs. We will bring them to justice no matter how long it takes.

But the Americans who liberated the camps four decades ago also gave us hope. They made it possible for us to look forward, to start again, to begin to restore our faith in the possibility of a better world, even while the memories of the recent horrors lived on. They offered a new chance for all peoples in all nations to join together in defense of humanity. These brave men showed that the evil ever-present in mankind can be confronted and eventually defeated by an even more powerful devotion to justice and the will to sacrifice for a greater good.

We must never forget that lesson.

The principles that the rescuers upheld, and for which many gave their lives, continue to animate heroic idealists of our own day, whose consciences will not permit them to acquiesce in injustice. It is the principle summed up by one of the spiritual mentors of the American Revolution, Edmund Burke, when he said: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing."

When Andrei Sakharov denounces the systematic denial of human rights by Soviet totalitarianism, and exchanges a position of

honor and comfort in the Soviet elite for a life of persecution and exile, he honors the example and the memory of those who have fought tyranny and liberated the oppressed. So do the brave individuals administering the funds provided by Alexander Solzhenitsyn to aid the families of Soviet dissidents. And Anatoly Shcharansky's courageous stand against the Soviet police state is a testament to the human will. He not only endures, he prevails through his example to others.

We have seen the spirit of the rescuers in the mothers of Buenos Aires' Plaza de Mayo, who protested the disappearance of their children week after week, year after year—even after some of their own numbers "disappeared"—until democracy was reborn in Argentina. And that spirit lives on today in the acts of those courageous South Africans, of all races, who have sacrificed—sometimes their privilege, sometimes their lives—to protest and expose the cruelties of apartheid.

Thank God most Americans have never had to face choices like this, but a few of us have. One who did was an American officer who was captured during the Vietnam war and survived an 8-year ordeal in a North Vietnamese POW camp. As Admiral James Stockdale put it:

"From this eight-year experience I distilled one all-purpose idea. * * * It is a simple idea. An idea as old as the Scriptures, an idea that naturally and spontaneously comes to men under pressure. That idea is, you are your brother's keeper."

The magnitude of these injustices, I repeat, is not the same. They cannot be equated with Nazi genocide, which was unique in the annals of human depravity.

But the principle applies universally: We are our brother's keeper. We must never turn a blind eye to the sufferings inflicted around the world. We must always draw strength and inspiration from the courage and altruism of the rescuers.

And we must never delude ourselves. Mankind's capacity for evil did not die in the bunker with Hitler. We see evil in the world all around us, in efforts to impose totalitarian authority on unwilling peoples, in efforts to subjugate, suppress, and sometimes vanquish entire races, classes, and religions.

The legacy of the rescuers admonishes us all to stand up and fight back.

The memory of the American liberators will live on forever, as will the memory of the evil they put an end to. We can only be thankful, and proud, that Americans were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to defend freedom and the rights of mankind. May we always have the courage, and the vision, to meet such challenges. Only then can the better world we all seek become a reality.

REMARKS BY ELIE WIESEL, CHAIRMAN, U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

Secretary Shultz, Secretary Marsh, distinguished members of the Senate and the House, members of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council and its Advisory-Boards, Ambassador Rosenne, Ambassadors:

Forty years after the event that remains a watershed in recorded history, let us remember its awesome legacy.

Let us remember those who took up arms and fought and those who chose to die with prayer or in resignation—and those who chose to live but were killed all the same.

Let us remember those who were tormented by the SS executioners and those who were persecuted by their accomplices, those who had faith in humankind and those who lost it.

Let us remember them all, for all shared the same fate—all were condemned for belonging to an ancient people whose forefathers had stood at Sinai and received the commandment: "Thou shall not kill."

Old and young, rich and poor, beggars and visionaries, scholars and poets, sages and workers, all were marked, all were singled out, all were hunted down: the heroes perished as martyrs and the victims as heroes.

They shared one dominant obsession: to be remembered. The enemy sought to destroy their memory. He killed them twice, the second time by burning their corpses, dispersing their ashes, so as not a trace of their beings remained.

Let us remember them, friends, for they had no friends. Forty years later we know what they, then, could not know: that they were alone, outside society and civilization, outside time.

Forgotten by humankind, forsaken by the Almighty Himself, they despaired alone, fought alone, died alone. Alone they faced mighty legions, among the mightiest in Europe.

Why was so little done to save them? Why weren't the railways leading to Auschwitz bombed? Why didn't the advancing armies alter plans and liberate the camps one day earlier?

These questions are painful for they demonstrate the insensitivity of our own allies to Jewish agony and death—but they equally indict the Russian government. Russian tanks were closer to Auschwitz than the Allies' were. Their warplanes could have bombed the railways in minutes—why didn't they? And what are the Russians doing now?

Whereas our people, our nation, and other Western nations are now endeavoring to serve the noble cause of memory, the Russian regime is still today guilty of distorting it. In the monuments of Auschwitz, the largest killing center of European Jews, the word Jew hardly appears. In Buchenwald, it is altogether eliminated—as is the memory of the valiant, brave and wonderful American soldiers who liberated us. Shame on Moscow—shame on the Communist rulers of East Germany who twist and distort and falsify history.

And honor to you, distinguished representatives of the American people.

In saluting these flags, Secretary Marsh, we proclaim our belief that evil must and can be defeated. Each flag enfolds its own tale of heroism and nobility. We honor the youth of America and of the Allied countries who fell in the Battlefields to liberate humanity from its nightmare. It was a moral war, a war between the forces of light and the forces of darkness, and it is in the presence of this conquering light that we gather to celebrate liberty. In our celebration we do not seek revenge or humiliation.

Just as forty years ago we did not seek revenge against the fathers, so today we do not seek humiliation of their sons and daughters. We seek, however, a commitment to memory and a true reconciliation, one based upon historical truth.

Mr. Secretary, we have not learned much—surely not enough—of the lessons to be drawn from the Holocaust experience. But we do know that one of them is to humiliate no one and another is to seek to enlarge the scope and intensity of human brotherhood. Yet another is to be sensitive to other people's feelings. And so we look with understanding upon our government's efforts to deal delicately with German sensitivities.

But what about American sensibility? Why is that not a factor in the high-level decision process? Did no one consider the pain and the shame some, if not most Americans, would feel upon learning that the President of the United States plans to visit a cemetery in which there are a good number of SS graves?

Have our policy planners forgotten what SS stands for? Auschwitz was conceived, structured, elaborated, perfected, built, organized and implemented by the SS. They were the killers of Jews primarily, but not only of Jews. They butchered Poles and Czechs, French and Dutch, Norwegians and Danes, Yugoslavs, Ukrainians, Greeks, Gypsies, homosexuals: Auschwitz was a universe and the SS were its gods. Why then should our President visit and honor their cemetery as though they had been nothing but patriotic soldiers who died for their fatherland?

Have we forgotten that those SS units were a part of the troops that launched the Battle of the Bulge; that they infiltrated American lines wearing American uniforms? That they slaughtered defenseless American war prisoners at Malmedy? Why did no one at the decisionmaking level think of what all those Americans who lost a son, a father, a brother might feel as they watch their leader—our leader—visit such a cemetery?

Mr. Secretary, please be our emissary. Tell those who need to know that our pain is genuine, our outrage deep and our perplexity infinite.

In this hall—in your midst—we feel strengthened. Your commitment to justice equals ours to memory. Thanks to you we are given to believe that what happened once will not happen again. Laws will not be distorted again—nor will man's vision of his own power on earth.

These ceremonies mean much to us, survivors. During a few moments we participate in something intimate and awesome. We are grateful to you for sharing them with us.

For us, to remember means to remain vulnerable. We see what you will never see: lines of shadows forming nightly processions under distant, tormented skies, drawn by mysterious sounds to eerie encounters with death and eternity. We discern some faces—we gather some tears, some words, some sighs, and make them our own. Do they hurt? They do. And why shouldn't they?

Memories of fear and silence, words of solitude and melancholy eyes filled with terror and despair. They represent our legacy. What will happen to it? Who will receive it? By what means will it be communicated? In agonizing image and anguished words? How are we to tell a story that cannot but must be told?

Somewhere in Eastern Europe, in places called Treblinka and Majdanek, Belzec and Auschwitz, hundreds and hundreds, thousands and thousands of human beings are being led into modern, scientific death-factories. With words and pictures we may follow them to the gate. Not beyond. What is awaiting them inside is so terrifyingly simple—and so heartbreakingly human—that one has no right to describe it.

And yet, we want everyone to know. We want you so much to know.

We invoke the past for the sake of the future; not to dwell on our pain, but to exorcise it. We remember what has been done to

the victims, not to spite the world, but to enlighten it.

If we forget, we too will be forgotten; but if we remember, we too will be remembered.●

● Mr. KOLBE, Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I stood together with hundreds of other Americans in the rotunda of this great Capitol to mark the "Days of Remembrance." It is altogether fitting and proper that we commemorate the 6 million European Jews who were martyred during World War II in this, the 40th spring after V-E Day.

There are no words to convey the totality of what the Holocaust signifies. The magnitude of this most heinous of Nazi crimes is beyond easy verbal description. Indeed, a vast body of literature ranging from scholarly histories to memoirs encompasses this subject. Fortunately, in recent years the neglect of the Holocaust in school texts has finally been addressed. This topic is now better placed and discussed in classrooms around the country.

The Holocaust has increasing significance for the world we live in today. It stands out as the single time in this century when morality vanished. The condemnation of civilized men and women everywhere is justifiably directed at the Nazis and their collaborators. But it is equally true that the judgment of history cannot be too kind to those persons and governments in the free world who were indifferent during the 1930's and whose actions were too little and too late in the early 1940's.

It is not my purpose to account for a history of the events that struck down the Jews of Europe between 1933-45. But the painful lessons of the past must not be forgotten. They must serve to point out to us where we failed, where we learned, and how we can prevent a repetition.

This month marks the 42d anniversary of the uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto. The particulars of this event have been admirably detailed in a number of excellent works: The Bravest Battle by Dan Kurzman, Uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto by Ber Mark, and in novels such as The Wall by John Hersey and Mila 18 by Leon Uris. The horrors endured by the inhabitants of the Warsaw Ghetto are beyond imagination: starvation, exposure, disease, torture, and murder. And yet, the revolt begun by a small band of survivors stands out as the most outstanding example of resistance to nazism through the whole of World War II. Armed with but a few guns and light weapons, the fighters in the ghetto held the SS off for over a month. Long after the revolt had been subdued with flamethrowers, aerial bombardment, the introduction of poison gas, starvation, and the systematic destruction of all buildings, Jewish fighters refused to surrender. Their martyrdom was not in vain because it served as a catalyst for future revolts that would take place in other ghettos and death camps.

It was also in the month of April 1944, that the Germans began implementing the "Final Solution" in Hungary. With the knowledge of Auschwitz fully known in the West, the Nazis set forth to exterminate the 400,000 Jews of Hungary. Even when the war was clearly lost and the Red Army was rapidly closing in, the Germans never lost sight of their goal in making those areas of Europe under their control free of Jews, or "Judenrein."

The Hungarian situation posed a challenge to the United States. Unlike previous years of Nazi rule that found the United States looking on passively as millions of Jews were put to death, our Government swung into action. Through the offices of the War Refugee Board, Raoul Wallenberg of Sweden was dispatched to Hungary to save as many lives as possible. In the midst of a continent dominated by madmen, Wallenberg rose to heroic heights of endeavor. Using every conceivable means, he confronted the architect of the "Final Solution," Adolf Eichmann, and thwarted the Nazis at every turn.

Wallenberg, at great personal peril, persuaded the Hungarian Government to stop the deportations to Auschwitz. When Eichmann attempted to get the death trains rolling again, Wallenberg went to border stations and literally prevented the trains crammed with people from leaving Hungary. In all, Wallenberg and his colleagues are credited with saving the lives of tens of thousands of Jews. One can only speculate on how many others could have been rescued had the truth of Auschwitz been known earlier. Even so, in an era of darkness and indifference, Wallenberg represents a shining light of courage and compassion.

The decision by this body to confer honorary American citizenship on Raoul Wallenberg in the hope of learning the true facts about his whereabouts from the Soviet Union is laudatory. Whether he is still alive or not, Wallenberg will always live on in the hearts of men and women of goodwill—a giant among heroes.

It was also in April of 1945 that American soldiers first glimpsed the hellhole that was Nazi Germany. As our forces pushed on toward victory, the concentration camps in western Germany were liberated. Along with our British allies, we learned that the atrocity stories had been woefully understated. Our vocabularies soon included places such as Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, Mauthausen, and Thereisenstadt. As we recall V-E Day, we must also remember these places where millions of innocent men, women, and children lost their lives. If there is to be a lasting meaning in why we fought the Second World War, it is to be found in the evil that conceived an ideology based upon racial arrogance, bigotry, hatred, and militarism.

Even now, four decades later, there are constant reminders of the Holocaust affecting us all. The Office of Special Investigations in the Department of Justice continues to research those instances where Nazi war criminals and collaborators gained both admittance and citizenship in our country. Since the program began in 1979, a number of mass murderers who fraudulently entered the United States have been denaturalized and deported.

We hear from time to time that old crimes should be forgotten and that the money spent on prosecution of war criminals could be better used elsewhere. Nothing could be more wrong. Murder is the ultimate crime. There can be no statute of limitations on murder. We cannot compromise this fundamental principle of justice. Regardless of how long ago, irrespective of age, those who went beyond the pale of civilized man and commited genocide must be ferreted out. I applaud the efforts of the Department of Justice and will lend my full support to their continued actions in this struggle to bring murderers to justice.

In a related vein, I wish to add my voice to those here in the Congress and out who seek to bring the "Angel of Death," Josef Mengele, to justice. Few men represent the embodiment of evil that we find in this loathsome human being. His role in selecting victims for the gas chambers at Auschwitz and in experimenting on people, particularly children, speaks volumes about the Holocaust and its horrors. For years Mengele has flouted the rules of society. But we will not rest until he is brought before the bar of justice. It is my hope that the cooperation of everyone working to apprehend Mengele will result in his early incarceration.

No expression of any of us can properly convey the significance of the events we remember today. No words can erase the scars, ease the pain, or undo the tragedy inflicted on so many millions of our fellow men and women. Over 1 million Jewish children were murdered along with 5 million of their parents and families. These losses are irreplaceable and we shall forever be the poorer for them. However, by acknowledging where we erred and by resolving to never let this happen again, to a degree we insure that the 6 million did not die in vain. We must not forget. No; we cannot ever forget the tragedy we call the Holocaust.●

● Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleagues for participating in this very important special order "On the Days of Remem-

brance of the Victims of the Holocaust."

Last fall, as many of us took time from our daily activities to pause in an earlier reflection of the 40th anniversary of the Holocaust, I had the opportunity to participate in services at our Nation's Capitol—memorial services that were the most moving of any I'd ever experienced.

For several minutes, I closed my eyes and as I listened intently to speaker after speaker retell the tragedies of the Nazi regime. I found myself truly understanding (as well as one who had not been there could) the horror, the pain, the suffering, and the absolute hopelessness which gripped those people, people who for no other reason other than the fact that they were Jews, were subjected to the most inhumane of treatment.

The world community could never properly make amends for such injustice but what all of us can and must do is dedicate ourselves to ensuring that time and distance do not allow us to ever forget.

For to forget is to somehow lay ourselves vulnerable to a reoccurrence. And that must never again be allowed to happen.

That is why it has become so very important that the doctor responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths and hideous medical experiments at Auschwitz—Josef Mengele—be tracked down and returned to West Germany for trial. We must all pledge to make the bringing to justice of Josef Mengele, and others like him, a top priority.●

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, 1985 marks the 40th anniversary not just of the end of World War II, but of the liberation of hundreds of thousands of Jews and other captives from Nazi concentration camps. This weekend, starting with a memorial ceremony at the Monument to Six Million Martyrs, Philadelphia will welcome the inaugural assembly of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors. It is a time for remembering all those who died in the concentration camps and those, like Raoul Wallenberg, who risked their lives to help save others.

Among the darkest pages in the history of mankind are those that mark the Holocaust—the systematic slaughter of 6 million Jewish men, women and children during World War II by Nazi Germany and its minions. Would that this Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust be unnecessary. But it is necessary. It is necessary that we recall this unprecedented barbarism of the Holocaust so that today's generations—and those yet to come—understand what can happen when hatred overcomes reason.

The Holocaust, so overpowering in numbers killed and depravities committed, numbs the heart and the mind. The tableau is so unbelieving that it becomes an almost surrealistic nightmare from the newspapers and news films of a past to be forgotten. This we cannot let happen, lest history be permitted another atrocity equal or greater.

The Holocaust is remembered also so we do not forget that lesser slaughters of peoples because of religion, color or ethnic origin have been taking place around the globe since the end of World War II. Along with the rest of the civilized world, perhaps, we in this country have looked the other way or have not exerted enough effort to prevent future slaughters or to bring those responsible to account.

I am reminded at times like these of an old World War II saying: "First, they came for the Jews and I did not speak. Then, they came for the Catholics and I did not speak. Then, they came for me and there was no one left to speak." Let us remember the bitter lessons of history as we look for peaceful solutions to today's problems. Surely, it is not an impossible dream to envision a world where Jews, Christians, Moslem, blacks and whites can live together without terror and war.

I know I shall be haunted constantly by the memories recalled when I stood at the Martyrs' Shrine, Yad Vashem, in Jerusalem. In that cradle of Christianity, Yad Vashem stands as an unforgiving reminder of how far we have traveled from Bethlehem to Dachau, and how little we have learned. Let it also stand as a reminder that the civilized world can do better—and we must.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of dignity and moral purpose that I rise to participate in this special order commemorating the victims of the Holocaust on the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the death camps.

As a young GI who helped take part in the liberation of one of those infamous camps, I was able to witness first hand the victims of those heinous crimes against humanity that were committed there. What I saw there can never be erased from my mind, and it can never be forgotten, certainly not in 40 years.

Forty years is the biblical time for a generation, and it is highly appropriate that we mark this 40th anniversary of the liberation of those camps with these solemn and dignified ceremonies. The countless generations of Jews and non-Jews who were gassed to death and were the victims of the most inhumane tortures ever conceived of by so-called civilized leaders cry out to us to remember what was done to them and why it was done to them. One especially thinks of the more than 1 million Jewish children who perished in the gas chambers and crematoria built by the Nazis, and of the lives, careers, families, and contributions to society that those children were never able to fashion. Neither can we forget those righteous gentiles, who, at the risk of their lives, tried to protect and shield their Jewish friends and relatives from the Nazi butchers.

Only a generation after the Holocaust and the liberation of the camps, voices are being raised in America and elsewhere claiming that the Holocaust is a hoax, that the death camps are a myth, that 6 million Jews were not murdered merely because they were Jewish, and that Jewish leaders helped participate in the slaughter of their own people. Nothing could be further from the truth! Six million people do not simply disappear, towns and communities do not vanish into the night, and a whole culture and civilization does not fade away in 6 years. The death and destruction of European Jewry was planned, plotted, and carried out by Hitler and his henchmen, and we dare not forget that fact. Neither can we forget that what the Nazis did to the Jews and all those peoples who they deemed as "subhuman" was done in accordance with the laws that the Nazis promulgated in Germany, laws that were defended and justified by Nazi judges.

Voices are also being heard today that seek to stop the continued attempts to bring all surviving Nazi criminals to justice. Mr. Speaker, we must reject that effort, because 40 years is a mere moment when compared to the enormity of the Nazi crimes, and we will not be able to rest until justice has been done and the remaining Nazi war criminals are tried for the monstrous crimes that they committed.

On this day commemorating the victims of the Holocaust and the liberation of the survivors, we would do well to pause and consider what the Jewish people recited as they were being led to the gas chambers: "I believe in perfect faith in the coming of the Messiah, and even though he may tarry, I still will wait for him." For the Jews who survived Hitler's hell on Earth, the American GI's who liberated the camps were the Messiah, and to those soldiers every Jewish person alive today is eternally grateful.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi death camps.

Time is a great healer of physical and emotional wounds. There are some events in human history so monstrous, however, that we cannot afford to allow the passage of the years to fully mask their horror. Such an event was the Holocaust.

It is almost difficult to imagine, 40 years after the fact, that human beings could subject other human beings to the suffering that was a fact of daily existence in the death camps. The uprooting of an entire population

and the separation of families which followed, the slave labor and the lack of adequate food, health care, and clothing under which it had to be performed, and the deaths—the 6 million deaths—which resulted from the Nazi's program of extermination in all of its twisted manifestations nearly defy comprehension. Because it is so hard to believe that such a thing could happen, it is imperative that we never forget that it did. In our remembrance we must commit ourselves as individuals, and as a people, to ensuring that, to the extent we can control events in the world, similar acts of horror are not repeated.

Today we particularly remember the inmates of the death camps, the other victims of the Holocaust, and the heroic Allied soldiers who fought their way across Europe to end their oppression. In remembering, we underscore their sacrifice and the need to speak out and act to prevent similar sacrifices in the future. The lessons of the Holocaust were lessons learned at a terrible price, and we can ill afford to forget them and risk paying that price again.●

● Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in commemorating the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. As the world marks the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps, it is painfully obvious that too many Americans are uninformed about the origins, the terrible toll, and the horrors of the Holocaust.

Today we remember the victims of the Holocaust, so that we may keep that memory fresh, and thus ensure that history does not repeat itself.

To further this effort, today I have introduced legislation to express the sense of the Congress that the teaching of the Holocaust be included in the curriculum of high school students. The Holocaust is one of the most important periods in modern history and yet it receives only cursory treatment in many, if not most, history courses taught at the secondary level. Clearly, we want our children to learn about the Holocaust so that they can be vigilant in their efforts to prevent any possible recurrence of this dark episode in history.

This resolution encourages the inclusion of the study of the Holocaust in the history or social studies courses developed by State and local school administrators. No history that gives short shrift to the Nazi atrocities can be considered comprehensive—students miss an important moral lesson—a lesson our civilization can ill afford to forget.

There is nothing more important than to make sure the memory of the Holocaust never fades. Let us today rededicate ourselves to a future where such a tragedy will not occur again and let us not forget the millions who gave their lives for their faith and love of freedom.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the Days of Remembrance of the Victims of the Holocaust. The Holocaust was one of the darkest chapters in human history, and remembering what happened during this period of annihilation and barbaric atrocities committed by the Nazis must be the basis for preventing similar tragedies from occurring in the future.

The world must never forget the unspeakable crimes systematically perpetrated against the Jewish people and against all humanity, and we must continue to keep the lessons of this destruction alive for all generations to follow.

When I was in Israel, I had the opportunity to visit Yad Va'shem, the stirring monument to the six million Jewish victims of the Nazis' persecution. The photos, artifacts, library, and ashes of the victims from every death camp serve as a permanent living memorial to the victims of the Holocaust, informing all those coming after the Holocaust generation of this terrible occurrence.

Our commemoration in the House of Representatives may be a painful reminder of a dark past. However, it is essential that our Government take the time to remember this outrageous crime against humanity, and to commemorate the victims of the Nazis. Out of our efforts come hope and renewal culminating in an unwaivering determination to prevent future genocides and defend liberty, self-determination, and religious freedom for all.

Yom Hashoah, the day of the Holocaust, is an important step in firmly implanting the memory of the Holocaust and the permanent documentation of this tragic event in the annals of human history. The horrors of the Holocaust and the memory of the millions who perished at the hands of the Nazis should never be forgotten by our Government. All of us who value justice and human freedom must work continually to insure that the Holocaust is not forgotten and that we all learn from the enormity of this atrocity.

Mr. Speaker, on these solemn days of remembrance, I join with the many Holocaust survivors living in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, and all Jews throughout the world, as we remember the victims of the Holocaust and renew our commitment to preventing another genocide from ever occurring again.●

● Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I have only two words to say about the unspeakable horrors of the Holocaust, and the enduring tragedies it generated. These words are—"never again."

Never again, so long as mankind endures, Mr. Speaker, should civilized people let holocausts occur.●

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, this evening we commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps operated by the Nazi regime. I am greatful to my friend and colleague Mr. SOLARZ for calling this special order so that this body can mark this occasion in an appropriate fashion. Nothing we do can ever bring back to life the millions of innocent individuals who perished under that evil tyranny, but we must do everything we can to keep the horror of the Holocaust fresh in our memories. Freedom now flourishes in West Germany; this is a democracy which was built with the support of the American Government and people. The nurturing of the free institutions and friendship of our former adversaries, Germany and Japan, is one of the proudest achievements of American foreign policy. But it would be foolish to suggest that this is any reason to be less mindful of the terrible infamy that was inflicted on the Jews and other innocents during that war. Quite the opposite, Mr. Speaker. Our love of liberty is only strengthened when we recall what happens to a nation that allows itself to fall under a regime of terror. We take time to mark this anniversary, and we carry the sadness in our hearts throughout the year.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in honoring the survivors, relatives, descendants, and friends of the 6 million Jews who were viciously and systematically slaughtered in Germany during the Nazi era of the 1930's and 1940's. This year marks the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps.

The Holocaust was an event so tragic and so senseless that even now, 40 years later, we find ourselves asking why it happened and, more importantly, how it could have happened. We are still not able to fully understand the incredible depravity of the Nazi planners and executioners and the shameful indifference of the rest of the world at that time.

The purpose of this special order, I believe, is not to dwell on the despair of the Holocaust, but to remember it well and to use its memory to strengthen us in never allowing such a thing to happen again. The Holocaust was not just a grotesque crime against Jews, but a crime against all of humanity. What happened in Auschwitz and Dachau could happen again elsewhere as long as there is tyranny among the powerful and silence among those able to prevent such crimes.

The burden is on all nations that value human life and share a belief in even the most basic human rights to

keep the memory of the Holocaust alive and to never again allow such cruelty and barbarism to occur.●

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the 1985 national observance of the days of remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust began on Sunday, April 14 and continues through Sunday, April 21. Sponsored by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, of which I am a member, the annual national civic commemoration takes place at noon today in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Europe from nazism. Representatives of the U.S. Army units that liberated the concentration camps will also participate in the national commemorative ceremony today.

Sadly, not all remnants of nazism have been eradicated. Neo-Nazi and right-wing fascism remains a most disturbing phenomenon. And there are others as well who would sooner forget the Holocaust than pay heed to its lessons. It is our continuing obligation to remember those who were the victims and to commemorate them—the men, women, and children whose lives were brutally taken from them.

The Holocaust is and always will be a part of German national heritage, as it will be a part of the dark side of recent history. Whether today marks the 20th or the 40th anniversary, the horrible deeds committed remain the same. Justice demands remembrance.

I strongly urge President Reagan to cancel his plan to visit a cemetery in Bitburg on his upcoming trip to West Germany. To lay a wreath at the graves of the SS, those elite Nazi soldiers who committed unspeakable crimes against humanity, would be to forget what our country has finally begun to remember.

Elie Wiesel spoke about the meaning of remembrance at the first national civic Holocaust remembrance ceremony in the Capitol rotunda in 1979. Shortly thereafter, Congress agreed to establish a living memorial to the victims of the Holocaust and to honor their memories in annual days of remembrance ceremonies. Elie Wiesel's story, "The Holocaust: Beginning or End?" is reprinted here for our attention.

THE HOLOCAUST: BEGINNING OR END?

Allow me to tell you a story. Once upon a time; far away, somewhere in the Carpathian mountains, there lived a small boy, a Jewish boy, whose dreams were filled with God, prayer, and song.

Then one day, he and his family, and all the Jews of his town, were rounded up and exiled to a dark and evil kingdom. They arrived there at midnight. Then came the first separation, the first selection.

As the boy stood with his father, wondering whether his mother and sisters would come back, an inmate came to tell him the truth; this road led to the final destination of the Jewish people; the truth was there; in the fire, the ashes, the truth was in death. And the young boy refused to believe him; it had to be a lie, a nighmare perhaps, this could not be happening, not here, not in the heart of civilized Europe, not in the middle of the twentieth-century. "Father," said the boy: "If this were true, the world would not be silent. . . ." "Perhaps the world does not know," said the father. And father and son walked on, part of an eerie nocturnal procession, toward mysterious flames of darkness.

Thirty-five years later—almost to the day—the same Jewish boy stands before you with a deep sense of privilege, to remind our contemporaries that in those times of anguish and destruction, only one people—the Jewish people—were totally, inexplicably abandoned—only one people were simply, cynically handed over to their executioners.

And we, the few survivors were left behind to bear witness and tell the tale.

On my first night in the camp, which was the last for most of my friends, my family, my relative, my teachers, I wrote:

"Never shall I forget that night, which has turned my life into one long night, seven times cursed and seven times sealed. Never shall I forget that smoke.

"Never shall I forget the little faces of the children whom I saw being thrown into the flames alive beneath a silent blue sky. Never shall I forget that sky.

"Never shall I forget those flames which murdered my hopes forever.

"Never shall I forget that nocturnal silence which deprived me, for all eternity, of the desire to live.

"Never shall I forget those moments which murdered my soul and turned my dreams into dust, into smoke.

"Never shall I forget these words even if I am condemned to live as long as God himself."

But what does one do with such memories of fire—with so many fragments of despair? How does one live in a world which witnessed the murder of one million children and remained world?

Those of us who were there are haunted by those whose lives were turned into ashes, by those whose cemetery was the sky.

Terror-stricken families hiding in ghetto-cellars. Children running with priceless treasures: a potato or two, a crumb of bread. Endless lines of quiet men and women on their way to mass graves, reciting the Kaddish, the prayer for the dead, over themselves. Teachers and their pupils, mothers and their infants, rabbis and their followers, rich and poor, learned and illiterate, princes and beggars—all pushed inexorably toward death. "Father," says a young boy," is it painful to die? Must I die?" "Think of something else," answers the father. "Think of tomorrow."

Treblinka and Ponar, Auschwitz and Babi Yar, Majdanek and Blezec: What happened? Did creation go mad? Did God cover his face? Did the God of Israel turn against the people of Israel? The question everyone asked upon arrival inside the gates was: What does it all mean? Was there a design, a secret pattern?

We didn't know, we still don't. How can anyone explain evil of such magnitude? How can anyone comprehend so much pain and anguish? One cannot conceive of Auschwitz with or without God. But what about man? Who can understand the calculated deprivation of the killers? The indifference of the onlookers? When Jews did have a possibility of leaving Europe, how many countries were there ready to accept them?

What was the Holocaust: an end or a beginning? Prefiguration or culmination? Was it the final convulsion of demonic forces in history? A paroxysm of centuries-old bigotry and hatred? Or, on the contrary, a momentous warning of things to come?

Turning-point or watershed, it produced a mutation on a cosmic scale, affecting all possible areas of human endeavor. After Auschwitz, the human condition is no longer the same. After Treblinka, nothing will ever be the same. The Event has altered man's perception and changed his relationship to God, to his fellow man and to himself. The unthinkable has become real. After Belsen, everything seems possible.

Admittedly, I belong to a tarumatized generation, hence I speak of my people, the Jewish people. But when I, as a Jew, evoke the tragic destiny of Jewish victims, I honor the memory of all the victims. When one group is persecuted, mankind is affected. Still, for the sake of truth, we must remember that only the Jewish people's extermination was an end in itself. Jewish victims, stripped of their identity and of their death, were disowned by the whole world. They were condemned not for what they did or said, but for who they were: sons and daughters of a people whose suffering is the most ancient in recorded history.

Every occupied nation, every underground movement received help from London, Washington or Moscow. Not the Jews: they were the loneliest victims of the most inhuman of wars. A single airdrop, a single rescue mission would have proved to them, and to the enemy, that they were not forgotten. But, Mr. President and friends, the truth is that they were forgotten.

The evidence is before us: The world knew and kept silent. The documents that you, Mr. President, handed to the Chairman of your Commission on the Holocaust, testify to that effect. Actually, pictures of Auschwitz and Birkenau had reached the free world much earlier. Still, when the Hungarian Jews began arriving there, feeding the flames with ten to twelve thousand persons a day, nothing was done to stop or delay the process. Not one bomb was dropped on the railway tracks to the death factories. Had there been a similar Joint Session of Congress then, things would have been different for many Jews.

And yet, and yet when the nightmare lifted, there was no hate in the hearts of those who survived. Only sadness. And, paradoxically, hope, hope as well. For some reason they were convinced that out of grief and so much suffering a powerful message of compassion and justice would be heard and received. They were convinced that the Messiah would come and redeem the world. They were convinced that, after Auschwitz, people would no longer yield to fanaticism, nations would no longer wage war, and racism, anti-Semitism and class humiliation would be banned forever, shamed forever.

Little did we know that, in our lifetime, we would witness more wars, new racial hostilities, and an awakening of Nazism on all five continents. Little did we know that, in our lifetime, books would appear in many languages offering so-called "proof" that the Holocaust never occurred, that our parents, our friends did not die there. Little did we know that Jewish children would again be murdered, in cold blood, by killers in Israel.

The survivors advocated hope, not despair. Their testimony contains neither rancor nor bitterness. They knew too well that hate is self-debasing and vengeance

self-defeating. Instead of choosing nihilism and anarchy, they chose to opt for man. Instead of setting cities on fire, they enriched them. Many went to rebuild an ancient dream of Israel in Israel; they all chose to remain human in an inhuman society, to fight for human rights everywhere, against poverty everywhere and discrimination, for humankind, always.

For we have learned certain lessons. We have learned not to be neutral in times of crisis, for neutrality always helps the aggressor, never the victim. We have learned that silence is never the answer. We have learned that the opposite of love is not hatred, but indifference. What is memory if not a response to, and against, indifference?

So let us remember, let us remember for their sake, and ours: memory may perhaps be our only answer, our only hope to save the world from the ultimate punishment, a nuclear holocaust.

Let us remember, let us remember the heroes of Warsaw, the martyrs of Treblinka, the children of Auschwitz. They fought alone, they suffered alone, they lived alone, but they did not die alone, for something in all of us died with them.●

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I joined my colleagues, friends, and survivors of the Holocaust in the Capitol Rotunda to help commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi concentration camps. It was an indescribably moving ceremony in which the regimental colors of the liberating troops were presented to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Sam Bloch led the Kaddish, and the Partisans' Hymn was sung by Cantor Isaac Goodfriend.

We remember and commemorate the victims of the Holocaust. By doing so we accept the obligation this memory places upon us to help prevent this evil from ever occurring again. The U.S. Holocaust Memorial is a memorial to those who died, and a reminder that eternal vigilance is required so that the potential for evil within humanity is not realized.

My colleague from New York and member of the Holocaust Memorial Council spoke eloquently on the lesson that the United States has learned from the Holocaust. He pointed out that where we had once turned our backs on the Jews of Europe, we have participated in the rescue of the Jews of Ethiopia; where we were once indifferent to the fate of the Jewish people, we now provide the support which makes possible the survival of the Jewish homeland.

I would also like to quote from the heartfelt words of Secretary of State George Schultz, who said

The men who liberated the camps in a sense liberated the world as well. They put an end to the physical tragedy, though they could not, and we should not, put an end to the spiritual anguish. We will never forget the atrocities committed by Hitler, and we will continue to pursue the criminals who carried out his awful designs. We will bring them to justice no matter how long it takes.

Our good friend Elie Wiesel reminds us that we must invoke the past to preserve the future, that there is a lesson in remembering, that if we forget we too will be forgotten, but if we remember we too will be remembered. Elie accuses the enemies of World War II of killing their victims twice, the second time by buring the corpses and distributing the ashes. I concur and I go on to say let's not kill a third time—by forgetting.●

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, during the 1930's the early 1940's, a commitment by the United States to rescue the Jews of Europe was tragically lacking. The history of the Nazi period haunts us with the lost lives of innocent men, women, and children—some of whom could have been saved if the governments of the Western world had shown more compassion. This period of history, for me, clearly establishes that Jews suffering persecution today are of special humanitarian concern to the United States.

This concern, is the basis for my policy of strong support for Israel. A strong, secure Israel guarantees that never again will Jews have to depend on the sufference of other nations for survival.

In addition, there is more the United States can do. We have recently seen tangible evidence of this in the key role the United States played in support of the transfer of Ethiopian Jewry to Israel.

But while we see renewed hope in the return of Ethiopian Jewry, the situation in the Soviet Union worsens.

As the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, I am one of the four Members of the House of Representatives consulted by the administration on levels of refugee admissions. My commitment to a U.S. refugee policy that is responsive to the needs of Soviet Jews is a matter of public record. I have asked for and received assurances from State Department officials that should the Soviet Union allow increased numbers of Jews to leave, we will raise our refugee admissions accordingly. I also have been assured that there will be no delay in initiating consultations under the emergency flow provisions of the Refugee Act if the gates are opened.

It is important that all know that our Government is unified behind one policy. We must firmly and consistently pursue our humanitarian aim and stand ready to act quickly and with compassion in response to any relaxation in current Soviet policy.●

● Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and sorrow that I join my colleagues in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the death camps. In light of this historical tragedy, Mr. Speaker, Americans and many foreign friends are inspired to observe this important day year after year.

History books tell countless stories of individuals who suffered at the hands of the Nazi regime. Over 6 million innocent Jewish men, women, and children were slaughtered during World War II. They were subject to a multitude of physical and psychological abuses at the hands of the Nazis. The world must never forget the unspeakable crimes committed against the Jewish population. I suggest that, as the leaders of this great Nation, we must at the very least, pay tribute to those who have died and suffered immeasurably.

As we reflect upon this terrible atrocity let us continue to challenge violations of human rights wherever and whenever they occur. Privileged as we are to live in a democratic society, we tend to take for granted the freedom of speech, of thought, and of worship that we enjoy. Let us pledge our support for the countless prisoners of conscience and the dissidents who continue to challenge the policies of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes that have led to direct aggression and the enslavement of nations.

The memory of the millions of innocent human beings who perished at the hands of the Nazis will live forever in the hearts and minds of those who cherish individual freedom, if we act to ensure those memories. Today's commemoration is an important aspect of that process and one which will have great meaning to freedom loving people everywhere.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support Senate Joint Resolution 15 calling for the designation of May 7, 1985, as "Helsinki Human Rights Day." It was nearly 10 years ago that the 35 signatories representing Europe and North America established the Helsinki Final Act pledged to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief, for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. On May 7, human rights experts from all 35 signatories will convene in Ottawa, Canada, to review the provisions of the Helsinki accords dealing with many aspects of East-West relations, including standards relating to human rights.

Unfortunately, the great potential of the Helsinki accords has not been fulfilled to date. Continuing violations of human rights in the areas of family reunification, right to travel and emigrate, and freedom of religion, throught, and conscience are evident. Such is the case for Abe Stolar, an American citizen and Soviet refusenik. In 1931, Stolar went to the Soviet Union with his parents who were natives of that country. When they arrived, their U.S. passports were taken and Soviet citizenship papers were issued. Stolar later received a new U.S. passport and he intended to stay only 2 years, but found he could not leave the country, even to visit Europe. In

51-059 O-86-46 (Pt. 6)

1975, he, his wife, and son filed for exit visas to leave the Soviet Union, however, they were denied the right to emigrate.

Stolar has lived as a law-abiding citizen in the Soviet Union for the last 52 of his 71 years and the only crime he has committed is filing for exit visas with his family in 1975. Now after waiting 9 long years. Stolar has been informed that he, his wife, and son, Michael, can emigrate from the Soviet Union. However, he has been told that Michael's wife will not be allowed to join the Stolar family as they begin their new life in Israel this Saturday, April 20, 1985. The Government of the Soviet Union has refused to recognize the marriage of Michael and his wife Julia because it was performed by a rabbi. Such action is clearly a violation of the spirit of the Helsinki accords which guarantee freedom of religious practice to citizens of the signatory nations.

As a member of a free nation we must speak out against such violations by the Soviet Union. We must seek the enforcement of the Helsinki accords and impress upon the Soviet Union our objection to the denial of basic human rights. It is my hope that the government officials in the Soviet Union responsible for this unfortunate situation reconsider their decision and allow Julia Stolar to join her family this weekend as they emigrate to Israel.●

● Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as we gather this year to observe the days of remembrance of the victims of the Holocaust we should make particular notice of this year being the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the extermination camps. It brings to mind that the single greatest abuse of human rights happened within our lifetime. Yet, the President of the United States tried to excuse himself from visiting a Nazi concentration camp on this trip to Germany because, as he said, "the German people have very few alive that remember the war, and certainly none of them who were adults and participating in any way." It is to combat attitudes such as this—that the Holocaust is merely another event mentioned in history books, to be studied then forgotten—that we stand here today.

When the soldiers of the Allied army broke through the gates at Auschwitz and Dachau and Treblinka and all the other camps which carried out the Nazi extermination policy they broke through a veil of ignorance that was wrapped around most of the world. These soldiers became witnesses for us all. If anyone will claim that the deaths that we remember today did not happen—there are men throughout this world who can say, "They did. I know. I was there."

Witnesses are a crucial part of remembering the Holocaust. It is not something of the distant past totally unrelated to current society. It cannot be excused as something which could not happen in our modern, civilized world. Today, the honor of living amongst those who survived the nightmare and the lesson of living amongst those who perpetrated the terror makes each of us a witness. And as witnesses we have a responsibility. We know what happens when people look the other way. It is up to us to pass the lesson on to our children and make sure that they never forget.

By remembering, we ensure that the world never forgets that a people and a culture were destroyed for all time. There are still Jews today, but the world that encompassed the Jews of Europe will never return. During the Nazi reign two-thirds of all Jews in Europe were destroyed; with them died a cultural tradition of 1,000 years. Although the fact of their existence has been extinguished, they will never be completely gone as long as we remember.

Members in this Chamber know better than most that the public never likes to be reminded of unsettling or bad news. This is one time when they must have the facts placed before them. This is one issue that we cannot afford to forget about. As lawmakers we must also review the facts, because the Holocaust was based firmly in Nazi law.

The laws were written to define Jews, to determine how Jews would be treated; then, step by step, the Jews were denied their rights. They lost their jobs, they could no longer participate in society. Next they lost their property, or were forced to sell their titles, claims, and ownership. Finally, they were separated from the rest of society and crowded into ghettos; after that the mass killing began. In Eastern Europe, the process sometimes was not so orderly. Teams of security police would rove from town to town simply exterminating the Jewish population. The expropriation of land and property followed later.

When we look back on these events we do so not to magnify this catastrophe above all others that resulted from the Nazi era. But this evil was unique among all others. The destruction of the European Jews was a cold and careful implementation of a policy. Vast bureaucratic machinery was created to carry out that goal. And every aspect of the murder, within the context of the Third Reich, was perfectly legal.

The complete extinction of the Jews as the "final solution" makes the Holocaust a uniquely Jewish issue. But we must never forget the others, the Gypsies, the Poles, the Slavs, and the remaining 30 or so nationalities who were represented amongst the millions of victims. The Nazi's chose to eliminate those who were "inferior" and in being allowed to make such a judgment, made all mankind a Holocaust victim.

There are many things to remember about the Holocaust. These are only some of them. As we commemorate the casualties of this abomination, we should celebrate its survivors. These witnesses contribute much to our understanding. We commend them for their courage and their ability to maintain their humanity after experiencing unimaginable evil. Today we let them know that we will not forget.●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the week during which communities throughout the world will gather to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi death camps. We are gathered here this evening to join in sharing the painful memories of the Holocaust and in paying tribute to the more than 6 million innocent lives that perished. We also join in sharing the survival of all those who escaped the death sentence of the Holocaust and the survival of a people the Nazis sought to annihilate.

This anniversary is an occasion marked by both solemnity and hope—solemnity because it is a reminder of one of the most heinous and horrific eras in the history of humankind, and hope because it is a reaffirmation of the lives of all those who survived and all those who are yet to come.

The lessons of the Holocaust must be taught from generation to generation so that humanity will never forget those dark days of 40 years ago. Through this commemoration we help to fulfill our collective responsibility to transmit the lessons of history, to endeavor to make known the unspeakable horridness of it, and to help ensure that never again will a Holocaust happen to any people.●

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join my colleagues in reiterating our commitment to the commemoration of the Holocaust. Such demonstrations are critical if we are to remember the moral obscenity of a government against 6 million people. In this combined effort of myself and my colleagues in Congress, we seek to alert the world to the atrocity which was the Holocaust and which still haunts us today.

The unbelievable human suffering that millions of Jews experienced in Nazi concentration camps must never be forgotten, erased by a government, or distorted through history.

We have not forgotten those victims who suffered beyond anything we have experienced or can even imagine today. But most importantly, this commemoration today shows our resolve to continue to work toward freedom of religion, freedom of association, and freedom from oppression and physical

harm, so that this tragedy can never happen again.●

● Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in this very important special order commemorating the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the death camps.

Forty years ago, the world witnessed the atrocities of the most shameful and horrible events of all times. It was an era of madness and evil. Six million Jews were put to death along with several million other victims of the Nazi's heinous crimes.

One only need to talk to the survivors of the Holocaust to become even more cognizant of the reality of the horrors. These survivors are growing small in number making it even more imperative that we never let their spirit, their courage, their message to the world be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, this is a day of reckoning for those who choose to forget and for those whose crimes go unpunished. It is a chapter of history we must never forget for the greatest crime would be to let the memory of the Holocaust fade and not to learn from the horror of this history.

In his remarks in last year's Holocaust Days of Remembrance ceremony, Elie Wiesel, chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, poet, author and a survivor stated:

> Memory is not exclusive. Memory is inclusive. It is because we remember the singular aspect of the tragedy that we remember its universality. We must also think of tomorrow as though it would be part of our memory. I think the world unleashed madness 40 years ago and that madness is still dominating spirits and minds of too many countries. There are too many signals of danger-racism, anti-Semitism, bigotry, fanaticism. We are scared of what humankind could do to itself. Therefore we tell the story.

We must continue to tell the story, to speak out against genocide of any people or faith, and most of all to remember.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in commemorating the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the Nazi death camps.

The greatest tribute we can pay these millions of martyrs is to ensure that their ordeal is never forgotten and their tragedy is never repeated. Let us resolve that we will never again remain silent in the face of evil.

While we all happily mark 40 years of peace in Europe, it would be wrong to commemorate this event without properly recognizing the victims of the Holocaust. The peace we now enjoy came at a very high price. We cannot mark this anniversary without remembering the victims who suffered the most at the hands of the Third Reich. Their tragedy must be a constant reminder to us of the price of silence.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I address this distinguished body today both as a Member of Congress and of the Jewish community. I rise, on this Day of Remembrance, to honor and commemorate those who suffered the atrocities and inhuman cruelty of the Holocaust.

This year we mark the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps in which 4 million of our people were gassed, and where an additional 2 million died of starvation, disease, and torture during the Second World War. I therefore believe it fitting, as we reflect on the horrors of 40 years ago, that we recall the worlds of those brave men and women who were the liberators, or witnesses, if you will, of the victims of Hitler's atrocities.

"They were the first free men," Elie Wiesel has said, "to see the world of horror," Although they have spoken simply of what they confronted, the sense of anger and profound sadness which their words convey are testimony to the enormity of the tragedy which they uncovered. The following are statements taken from testimony of U.S. Army Veterans given at the International Liberators Conference in 1981:

Anton Bild, a soldier involved in the liberation of Dachau recalled that:

> After six months of combat duty with the Seventh and Third Armies, I thought I could take just about anything. But to be confronted with the realization of the concentration camp Dachau was an earth shaking, cataclysmic event in my life. It was a day for me when humanity failed miserably in the world. As we approached the camp and came into the railroad siding, I was confronted with these thirty or forty boxcars crammed with people that had starved to death in the cars. No one should have to face a death like this.

The recollections of Richard Elberfeld, a liberator at Bergen-Belsen, are no less horrible to contemplate. "We found thousands of unburied bodies when we went in. We found other thousands of people who were near death, who were in the huts or the fields . . . I had no idea anything like this really existed."

Other eyewitnesses to the horror of the camps speak of lingering and tormenting memories. Kenneth Colvin, assigned to the 515th Medical Clearing Company, administered emergency medical treatment in many of the camps. "We didn't talk much about what we saw," he recalled. "It wasn't until about 15 years after the war that this thing hit me, I started getting nightmares. About 2 years ago I thought I could handle it. I went back to Katzen Friedhoff. All that was left of that camp was half of the crematoria door, and I just collapsed when I saw that.

Some recollections, such as that of Leon Freedman, a liberator at Buchenwald, evoke an overwhelming sense of sadness. Noticing the pitiful condition of small groups of people gathered along the road as the 76th Army Division to which he was attached approached the camp, Mr. Freedman recalled that:

> It became clear to us that something dreadful had happened. As we approached this huge complex of buildings with barbed wire fences, we began to notice a very distinct foul odor * * * And shortly before coming to the gates we had noticed some railroad cars on a siding. One was partially opened up. We could see bits of clothing. We noticed that it was composed all of children's clothing, shoes, sweaters, hats, mittens, coats, clothing of all description, only of children. We couldn't seem to understand it. We saw no children.

Many of the eyewitness accounts focus on the response of the victims to the arrival of their liberators. Many greeted their rescuers with only dazed silence. For others it took several days before they would be convinced that their tragic ordeal was finally over. Marie Ellfrity, who served as a nurse at Mathausen, related that still others, a few days after the liberation, "simply laid down and died. They refused to die as prisoners, they wanted to die in freedom, and so, after they were convinced of who we were and why we were there, they simply laid down and died."

Perhaps most disturbing of all is testimony which speaks of the indifference of the outside community to the plight of the victims. Reginald Ashby of the 11th Armored Division, liberators of Gaussen One, recalled that for him:

> The most shocking thing that took place was the indifference to the civilian population to what had been going on in the camp. They seemed to have been well aware of what had been going on. I couldn't then, and I can't now, come to any conclusions as to what could have possibly gone on in their minds to have permitted something like this to take place. There are no words to describe this kind of condition. It's beyond comprehension, what people can do to people.

Another liberator, Alexander Breuer, recalled that because he spoke German he had been ordered to join a team designated to negotiate the surrender of Weimar. In their negotiations with the city's mayor, Breuer recalled that the subject of Buchenwald had been brought up as an aside. "Incidentally," the Americans were informed, "there is this place called Buchenwald." The mayor was asked to bring them to the camp and escort them through it. Although he knew of Buchenwald he had never seen it; he was unaware of its enormity. Three days after his visit he took his own life.

The Rabbi Gunter Plaut, attached to the 104th Timberwolf Division, which liberated the camp at Nautthausen on April 11, 1945, stated his belief that until that morning many of our men didn't really fully understand what the war was all about. Reflecting on what he himself had seen on that morning, Rabbi Plaut felt it to have

been too enormous a crime against humanity to be the responsibility of man alone. "I believe," he said, "that God must also share a measure of responsibility. His responsibility is and was that He gave us the freedom to decide. He gambled on us in a sense * * * and in this instance He lost."

The events which these men and women have recalled represent the most tragic and shameful ever to have occurred. They describe a world from which all compassion and sense of human dignity and worth had been driven out, a world of abysmal horror and loneliness for the Jewish people. The crimes of Nazi Germany were of such a magnitude that they must never be forgotten, and such that they can never be forgiven. In the anger, outrage, and sadness which their testimony expresses, however, we can also extract a measure of hope that events such as these will never be allowed to occur again.

Thus, it is of paramount importance, on this Day of Remembrance, that we refresh in our minds the tragic memory of the Holocaust and vow to do what we can to assure that it will never happen again.●

● Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by commending my distinguished colleague from New York, STEPHEN SOLARZ, for organizing the special order today commemorating the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the death camps.

One might think that it would be trite to say we must never forget the Holocaust, but unfortunately, it appears that that message is one we must strongly emphasize today. The President has added a ceremony to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust as an afterthought to a planned trip to Germany to celebrate 40 years of peace. Such an event should have been a priority on the President's agenda. Therefore, today's special order takes on an even greater importance.

The murder of 6 million Jews, as part of a planned genocide on behalf of the Nazis, is a part of world history that we can never forget. All people of the world share in the responsibility for that horrible chapter in our history. It was only 40 years ago that the camps were liberated, survivors of that horrible experience are alive today, and yet we hear people questioning the occurrence of the Holocaust. This is an insult to those who died in the Holocaust, their families and the survivors.

It is hard for us today to understand the terror of the "Crystal Night" when Jewish stores were looted and destroyed, Jewish homes were broken into and thousands of Jews were rounded up and put onto cattle cars for that long, and usually fatal trip to the Nazi concentration camps. It is hard for us to understand today how anyone who lived near the camps could not be outraged by the stench from the ovens as Jewish men, women, and children were cremated. When an event is too confusing or too painful, it is human nature to say that is the past, we must put the past behind us. But that is something we cannot affort to do.

Each and every one of us has a responsibility to teach our children about the Nazi regime, its philosophy and the tragic events which were a result of Hitler's reign of terror. Only by understanding what happened during those dark years, by knowing that the Nazi philosophy is the antithesis of what we in America believe and what we fought to preserve in World War II, only by never forgetting, can we ensure that it will never happen again.

Mr. Speaker, today I celebrate the liberation of the Nazi death camps by the Allied soldiers and I mourn the tragic, meaningless deaths of millions of men, women, and children. But the best way to commemorate the liberation, and the most effective way to show respect for the murdered, is to remember their deaths and to pledge, never again.

● Mr. LENT Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in observing this Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the Holocaust. In conjunction with the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, ceremonies are taking place here in our Nation's Capital and throughout the country commemorating the end of the Holocaust and the liberation of Nazi death camps at the end of World War II.

As participants in this solemn tribute, we believe very deeply in the need to remember the cruel and inhuman tragedies of the Holocaust. It's almost inconceivable that one group could systematically annihilate 6 million innocent Jews. Yet that is what happened.

It's a painful and emotional experience to look back and recall what happened during that terrible chapter in history, 40 years ago. It's painful to think of the families torn asunder, the lives ripped apart, and the broken bodies left behind.

Nevertheless, the survivors and witnesses to the horrors of the Holocaust are a living testament to the truth. And so their story is never forgotten; we must maintain a constant vigil against anyone who would belittle the suffering of the Jewish people, or deny that the Holocaust ever happened. We have an important responsibility to past and future generations to see that such evil crimes never go unchallenged. We must ensure that the memory of the Holocaust is always fresh in our minds and in the minds of our children. Only in this way, can we hope to prevent such atrocities from recurring.

The story of the Holocaust must also be a story of faith and freedom. In the death camps and throughout much of Europe during the war, the mere act of existence was a form of resistance. This is a story of humanity overcoming inhumanity.

Our actions today are in menory of the victims of the Holocaust. Let us send the message that they have not suffered in vain, and let us reaffirm our pledge to mankind for the future when we say: "Never again."●

● Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in national observance of the Days of the Victims of the Holocaust. Forty years ago, 6 million Jews and millions of other victims were murdered in the systematic genocide perpetrated by the Nazis. Deprived of their political rights, occupations, and property, the Jews in Germany suffered physical violence, mental anguish, and death at the hands of the Nazis. We come here today because, in the words of Holocaust survivor, noted author and theologian, Elie Wiesel, "This is our duty as well: to bear witness. For 6 million Jews who perished in the Holocaust * * * for the Holocaust was a Jewish tragedy with universal implications."

My personal understanding of the Holocaust comes from my long association with refugees of the concentration camps who reside in my district. From them, I have learned of the horrors of the Holocaust and of their personal tragedies. From their example, I have also learned the depth of the human capacity for strength and survival.

It is then our duty to remember those whose lives ended in the Nazi concentration camps and to insure that they not be forgotten. We must also give comfort and support to those who survived and through much courage and strength have managed to rebuild their lives and contribute greatly to our own.

For them, I solemnly stand here in remembrance of their loss and the loss to the world of 6 million Jews and others who perished in Nazi Germany.●

THE GROWING FEDERAL DEFICIT

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

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, the crucial issue facing this Congress is how best to reduce these growing Federal deficits. Our national economy cannot withstand deficits of $200 billion piled one on top of the other. It is unfair to future generations to burden them with this debt.

These huge Federal deficits result in the Federal Government borrowing

much of the money that ought to be available to the private sector. That increased Federal borrowing crowds out the private sector and, therefore, results in our citizens and our businesses and our farmers paying higher rates of interest than they ought to pay.

If the deficits continue to grow, at some point in time interest rates will only go higher, and when that point arrives, we will see a recession beyond the depths of any recession we have experienced in recent history.

Those higher interest costs would push even more farmers off the land, would push even more businesses into failure, and will bankrupt our Nation.

Those high deficits will have an effect on the value of the dollar. The value of the dollar is high because we are financing this deficit by the sale of Treasury bills, many of which are purchased by foreign investors. And it is the purchase of those Treasury bills by foreign investors that helps to push up the value of the American dollar.

So not only our farmers but other industries in America that are sensitive to interest rates, that are sensitive to the value of the dollar, and in need of export markets are adversely affected.

So we are losing millions of American jobs; in fact, we are exporting American jobs due to these Federal deficits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I really want to compliment the gentleman for what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I am the mother of an 18-year-old, and I suppose the gentleman's age is closer to the 18-year-old than to mine, but nevertheless if I were a young person in this country I would be very concerned about where the jobs are going to be, and I find that my young son and his friends in college are all saying, "Where are our markets, where are we going to have jobs, where are we going to be able to work and who is talking about it in this country?" I think when you see the trade deficit, when you see the foreign deficits, I think all of those things become terribly critical.

Nobody has really drawn a road map to the horizon. We keep worrying about our ingrown toenail. The only problem is now that ingrown toenail is this massive debt. I always remember people used to say, "Blessed are the young for they are going to inherit the national debt."

Well, they are going to inherit a lot at the rate we are going.

So I think what the gentleman is talking about makes an enormous amount of sense.

You look at this whole hemisphere and the questions for young people are not only where the jobs are going to be and where we are going to be competitive in all sorts of different areas, it is also going to be what kinds of relations are we going to have in this hemisphere and where are they going to end up, what are they going to end up doing?

I think the last thing they want are jobs going into South America in some kind of a war. That is one of the things that we will be debating next week.

I think when they talk about jobs what they have in mind is something where they can have a decent standard of living. We see the cutbacks in student aid really meaning that it is going to be much tougher for kids to get an education. I think everybody in the world is aware of the fact that America is going to need more education, not less. You have to have a real optimistic view of the world to think everybody is going to be able to get by with less education.

I think what we talk about here in a big, big picture type of view, translates down to the man on the street in a very painful manner. We talk about all of this. I was on the streets of Denver talking to one of the policemen who said, "Well, I always thought I was middle class, and now I find I am not." I said, "What do you mean by that?" He said, "Well, I have been a policeman all my life, and I thought I earned a good living. My daughter has been admitted to the Colorado School of the Mines"—which is a private and expensive school—and he said, "I cannot send her. I feel absolutely terrible. I feel like I have let my whole family down. I cannot send her. I have other children and I would have to sell them" and so forth and so on. So she would have to compromise at a much lower level.

Now the Colorado School of the Mines is a high tech type of education. Those are the kinds of jobs to see young people with capabilities but whose parents feel that they cannot send them because they do not have the money, is very troublesome. So no matter what part of the equation you look at, there does not seem to be a lot of progress. There also does not seem to be much progress in the whole piracy area. When we talk about jobs, we keep forgetting that probably the one area where America can compete will be in intellectual properties, intellectual properties, which is writing books, writing music, doing software for computers, doing video tapes, doing whatever it is because of that wonderful American creativity which is there, the essence of it being able to be distilled, and so forth and so on.

□ 1710

But what is happening to it? It is one of the few things left in our whole international trade area that has a balance of trade that is favorable. We make more money exporting records; we make more money exporting movies, exporting TV shows, exporting software, but it is all getting ripped off.

This administration is not being aggressive at all about pursuing pirates, and some of those pirates are our best friends, supposedly; pursuing them as they copy this stuff. You watch more and more of our companies having to move offshore or move somewhere else because what, when you back up and think about what would you have to sell an automobile for if people could drive it somewhere and make a copy of it?

So I could buy an automobile and I could go make a copy of it and give it to you. And then you could go make a copy of it and give it to your friends, and so forth and so on, and they would never get another penny. The only money you would get would be from the first automobile, because I can tell you everybody would go make a copy from then on.

That is what is happening in books; that is what is happening in records; that is what is happening in videotapes; that is what is happening in software. As a consequence, you cannot sell the first item for enough money to keep the money coming back to you so you can then go ahead and design the next automobile or the next thing.

We understand the intangible property; that is, automobiles, but we do not understand it when it moves to intangible property.

So I think what the gentleman is talking about is really important, and there are so many different facets of it, and I just do not see an aggressive enough policy going on, and a defining of what the policy is. I only see that we want to a meeting and agreed to have another meeting, or we went to a meeting and we were really pleased because they did not growl at us; they smiled at us; or we went to a meeting and they said, "Well, maybe next year."

I also know the gentleman comes from a State like mine, that has a lot of agriculture. I think that is one of the areas, too, where you could have all sorts of things being done.

For example, we could send beef from Colorado to some of the countries that are our trading partners—to whom we owe great debts at the moment, now that America has become a debtor nation. We could send cattle over there first class, on airlines, sitting in seats and still make money at their own domestic market.

We could do all sorts of things. I think that is very important to point out; that it is not just the Japanese; it is us or Europe. They protect all of their agriculture markets.

I am for free trade, but it must be reciprocal. I think America competes,

but it must be reciprocal. You have to allow our products in freely, and you also cannot allow piracy to go on.

Piracy is going on in some of the Southeast Asian countries that rely on us the most to defend them.

Where are the jobs? It goes back to the 18-year-olds sitting around in the college dorms saying to me, "Hey, you're Scott's mother, you're supposed to know everything, where are the jobs? What should we study? You know, what's going to be out there?"

At this point, it is really very hard to answer that question. I do not see an aggressive enough policy going on in that area.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this up.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. It is of great concern to all of us, what we can do to reinvigorate our economy, to make sure that the jobs are there for these students today, students who in the very near future will be leaving their vocational school or their college, and planning to enter the work force, but in what capacity?

As I started out remarking in just one area, Madam Speaker, our policy is woefully inadequate because we are piling up these deficits that are exporting jobs, because the high deficits lead to a high value of the dollar, and it means that we lose that competitive advantage in the world market; other nations take up those markets from us, and we are left with declining employment in a number of our American industries.

The high deficits are hurting the farm sector, because of the high interest rates that it causes for our farmers. Farmers have to borrow a lot every year to put in their crop, and when they cannot make a profit at the end of that year because, again, the value of the dollar is high and they cannot sell as much overseas, that higher interest rate gets rolled forward year after year, and pretty soon our farmers go out of business; and when they fail, businesses and banks in their community fails and the employment of the American workforce—and about 20 percent of our jobs in America are jeopardized because that is how many of our jobs are related to agriculture, one way or another.

So what does this kind of a deficit policy mean to the future? It means kind of a shaky future for a number of these students that are preparing their minds for their place in society, but we are not offering them a place because those jobs may not be there on the trend we are following.

Mr. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, one of the interesting things that I find is, I grew up with my parents saying that it was the duty of each generation to turn the country over to the next generation in a little better shape than they found it. If you had just accomplished that, that you had accomplished a lot.

I am not sure we are going to be able to say that to this next generation. We are certainly not turning it over in better shape; we are turning it over in much deeper debt.

The other piece of all this is how precarious it all is. As the gentleman mentioned, when you have this high level of the dollar being so high, then we attract foreign money in here.

All that has to do is change a little bit, and it all goes home. Then they control whether our economy comes crashing down, not us. So I do not really like relying on other people keeping their money deposited in this country. That is also quite frightening, as you look at it, and as you attract "scare" money, then it starts to scare you; it can turn around and bite you right back if the mood changes, and we have all seen those kind of swings back and forth.

If the gentleman would not mind my changing the subject just a tad, and I feel bad about interfering in the middle of his special order on something that I think is so terribly important.

I wanted to talk about one other thing that I had mentioned this morning that some people did not understand. I wanted to explain it a little bit further. There are several things.

I had mentioned this morning how I stand here with a German name, and am really rather offended by what the White House is saying they have to do not to offend German sensibility.

I find that going to Bitburg and laying a wreath offends my German sensibilities. I do not think that Bitburg stands for what Germany stood for. It is not what we are celebrating in this celebration going on in June.

Europeans are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. The end of World War II in Europe means that they finally contained a government that had gone mad; that is, Nazi Germany.

But they also liberated Germans from that government, too. There were some people there who did not like it, believe it or not.

So to go there and lay a wreath in the cemetery where the SS is buried—and the SS were not innocent young boys that were called in; these were the hardcore, these were the intelligence officers, these were the guys who ratted on people. They knew full well what they were doing. They were party members.

To go there violates the whole idea of what this celebration in Europe is about. I think it is very important for German-Americans to speak out on that, too. If I had to look and say, What is the spirit of Germany? The spirit of Germany is Konrad Adenauer, who tried to rebuild Germany in a very difficult period after the war, to return to the democratic principles and to return to freedom and so forth.

That is who we should be celebrating, that Germany was allowed to finally rise up from under this yoke.

I also said this morning how offended I was that the TV cameras were showing the White House advance team going around and visiting different concentration camps, looking for the right one.

Now, what does that mean? Are you looking for the nicest one? One with carpeting? Come on.

□ 1720

There is nothing nice about the concentration camps. They were all horrendous. I think one of the brave things that Germany did, and it took a lot of guts, was to preserve those concentration camps so that people could go see them and see how horrible it was and to see what happened when a government goes mad with power. I have gone through several of those camps. I must say it was the most horrendous experience of my life. It causes nightmares forever, because you see it, and you just cannot believe that it went that far; but it did.

So here is the German Government, they are not afraid to run from their past. They set it out there, and they say, "this was wrong, and we want people to come here because we never want this type of horrible thing to happen again."

And we have the President saying he is not going to go there because it would offend German sensibilities.

I think it is all mixed up. And I certainly hope over this weekend that they can get it straightened out, because when you see the leader of the free world putting wreaths on a cemetery where there are SS graves, something is turned upside down, and I am sure Europeans are scratching their heads trying to figure out, "what in the world is it that the Americans think we are celebrating here?"

I also think that out of respect to the millions of people who were lost and the awful Holocaust that went on in World War II—and I realize this is probably not your age span, but it was mine, and I do not feel like a total dinosaur it was in my age frame that that terrible thing occurred—we should remind ourselves that it was not something that happened in the deep, dark, ancient past, it happened within a generation that is still alive and kicking and around. Germany is doing everything that it can to make sure it never happens again. We should, too. We should dedicate ourselves to that over and over again.

I think, again, our young people would feel more comfortable about where we are steering the course of this Government if they saw that kind of commitment coming out of this

Government, not only to where the jobs are, but to traditional things the Government has always stood for—human rights, liberty, freedom, all those kinds of things. They are not just words. They are conditions, they are conditions that are very hard to maintain. Someone is always tempted to steer a little further.

If I had my way, I think I would mandate that every leader of every state had to go through those concentration camps, because it is such a graphic example of how horrendous absolute power can be. We all say absolute power corrupts absolutely. You do not understand what it means until you walk though there and see what human beings did to other human beings and the kind of insane rationale they put behind it.

But the United States is going out on the wrong side on this, and it disturbs me very, very much. My German sensibilities are disturbed by the way we are coming out on the wrong side. I would really like to make that very clear. I only had a minute to do it this morning.

So I again thank the gentleman for yielding to let me clear that up.

Mr. PENNY. I certainly do not mind yielding to the gentlewoman for that purpose. It is an important issue and one that does need further discussion.

As someone who serves on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am fully familiar with the attitude of American veterans about this upcoming trip by the President to Germany, and they are somewhat baffled by the confusion over the schedule, baffled on the one hand that the President would schedule that kind of a visit to a cemetery where some of the soldiers who were responsible for those atrocities are buried, and baffled, as well, by the indecision that the President seemed to have over whether or not to visit one of those concentration camps as a reminder that in fact we do not want the world ever to witness that kind of holocaust again.

I am reminded of last year when the President went to Europe to celebrate the D-day invasion, the time when all of the allied forces came together to launch an offensive that eventually brought about the end of that war and the end of that Nazi regime, and how proud we all were as our President stood there reminding us of the principles that brought the allies together and the kinds of freedoms that our Nation stood for and the freedom that we now have helped to provide for Europe, the kind of freedom that their governments have maintained in the years since that war. It stands in sharp contrast to the pride all of us—veterans and all Americans—felt when the President was there just last year commemorating that day to have this kind of contradiction exist in the schedule that he has set for his trip back in Europe in the coming weeks.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point, because the spirit of Normandy was one that we were all very proud of, and we were very proud, even though it was also painful to recall the horrendous losses that were sustained by American young people and by young people of all of our allies.

But nevertheless we won, we persevered, and we were willing to pay a very high price for it.

And yet by these actions, this June and this May, it appears that that was all celluloid, that we did not understand what it was all about, we did not understand the depth and the feeling and what it all meant. And I just really hope this can get clarified. Maybe it is because of the transition in leadership, maybe it is lots of other things. I do not know what it is. But I certainly hope it all gets clarified.

I had the privilege of being in Europe last week with parliamentarians from all over Europe who were meeting in Stockholm when this all came out, and they were stunned. They were saying, "What? what? He is doing what? Does he know what Bitburg stands for? Does he know who is there?"

We can try and brush it off here and say, well, it was just innocent 17-year-old kids who happened to sign up for the military; but everyone In Europe knows that that is where the SS is, and those were not innocent 17-year-old kids. So it does not sell, it does not sell at all.

I just hope that gets clarified. And I also hope that we can stop the images of the advance team being out looking for the right—whatever that means—concentration camp. There is no right concentration camp. They were all horrendous. And the quicker we can get it all turned around and get back to the real spirit of Normandy and the real spirit that our veterans want us to commemorate, I think we are all going to be much better off. So if you take the veterans, if you take the religious community, if you take the European community and you take the Germans—I think Germans are much prouder of where they were, when Conrad Adenauer rebuilt them and what it took—when you put all of those together, it really seems to be incumbent that we move and get all of this straightened out.

So, again, I thank the gentleman very much for pointing that out.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, if I might, I want to return to my discussion on the deficit, because I would like to elaborate on one possible approach to reducing this red ink.

The question is often asked: How do you stop this deficit from growing? And I think the simple answer is: you just stop spending more.

I once had a senior citizen back in my district tell me: Why don't you folks out in Washington do like we do here in our own budgets? When we run out of money, we just quit spending money.

And that is simply the best way to get at this Federal deficit. That means we freeze at last year's spending level; you do not authorize or appropriate more money to be spent this year than we spent last year. And that, then, allows a growth in the economy. And in spite of some of the areas in our economy where there are difficulties—and certainly the farm sector is one of them—we do have enough growth in our economy that this coming year we are going to generate about $70 billion of tax revenues over and above that which we are bringing in the current fiscal year.

So if you do not spend more, and therefore the only addition to your budget that would occur is the addition that is caused by interest on the deficit, which must be paid, and by demographics in some of the programs, like our retirement programs, where new people are reaching retirement age, you can reduce the deficit next year by about $50 billion. And that, after all, is the deficit reduction target set by the President when he submitted his budget to Congress this year.

There are a lot of proposals around here that talk about freezing the budget, including the administration's proposal, which does amount to a spending freeze. But most of these budget-freeze proposals are unacceptable politically because they either exempt certain programs or, while freezing total spending, they allow for major shifts in spending priorities; they are not across the board.

The administration's proposal is not across the board. While they would cut deeply into other programs below this year's funding level, they offset all of those savings by increasing spending in other areas. So they are not being evenhanded. As a consequence, I do not think, politically, that kind of a budget can sell.

I have been told by people across my congressional district that they would be willing to sacrifice if only they knew that everyone else would share in that sacrifice. That is the attraction of an across-the-board spending freeze.

How do we make sure that that sacrifice is borne equally? We do it by an across-the-board freeze on function levels. The function for our Federal budget is divided into 17 categories. Those categories are: Defense; international affairs; general science, space, and technology; energy, natural resources, and environment; agriculture;

commerce and housing credits; transportation; community and regional development; education, training, employment, and social services; health, Social Security, and Medicare; income security; veterans' benefits and services; administration of justice; general government; general purpose fiscal assistance; and net interest.

□ 1730

There are other categories; allowances and undistributed offsetting receipts that are not actual spending categories as part of our basic budget, but they make up the remaining two items in our functional categories.

If we would freeze spending authority in each one of these functional categories at fiscal year 1985 levels, for fiscal year 1986, we would result in a freeze that would keep Federal spending in fiscal year 1986 at $974 billion. That compares almost identically with the spending level that would result under the administration's plan submitted to Congress. The only difference is that whereas their proposal cuts deeply into some portions of this budget, cuts deeply into some of those functional categories, it offsets those savings by increasing dramatically spending in other areas. It is not fair; it is not across-the-board. We ought to begin with an across-the-board lid on spending in each of these categories as the fairest way to address this deficit.

If then there are programs within each of those functional categories, programs within Transportation, or within Health Care, or within Income Security, or Energy, where you want to spend a little more within that same category, find another program where you can spend a little less, so all in all you do not spend any more next year than this on that functional category. That is the way my across-the-board freeze would work. Most people recognize that that would be the fairest way to hold the line on Federal spending. An across-the-board freeze, in my judgment, is the only way to approach this Federal deficit with fairness.

There are those who say, "Yes, but can we not go farther than an across-the-board freeze?" I think perhaps we can, but I think you need to begin with a freeze so that the element of fairness, the element of equal sacrifice is an essential part of our budget policy, telling everyone that is a beginning point no function within the Federal budget is going to get more than it received last year. Once you have asked everyone to make that equal sacrifice, if, based on priorities, if based on our need to further reduce that deficit below these levels, you can find some programs where you in fact can spend less, then let us make that choice and let us get 218 votes for that kind of a budget option.

This budget freeze will be introduced next Tuesday here in the House. I have sent a letter to my colleagues asking them to join me in the introduction of this across-the-board freeze so that we have this option on spending control on the table ready for consideration by the Budget Committee, as it continues its work to develop a budget for this coming fiscal year.

I would hope that my colleagues would join me in cosponsoring that legislation and join all of us who are trying to present freeze amendments to authorization bills as they come to the floor. Join all of us in supporting this kind of a freeze alternative for this year as we complete our budget work here in the House.

In speaking about the Federal deficit, I want to enter into the RECORD two articles that have been written recently addressing this issue. The first is an article which appeared in the Washington Post and it was written by the chairman of the Budget Committee, our friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAM GRAY. This article is entitled, "A Deficit We Can't Outgrow." The article begins:

Will the real President Reagan please stand up? Or, at the very least, will he tell us whether he thinks America has a deficit problem?

On one hand, there's the President Reagan who delivered, as only he can, a stirring and uplifting State of the Union address. He said that the best way to reduce deficits is through economic growth—that "each added percentage point per year of real GNP growth will lead to a cumulative reduction in deficits of nearly $200 billion over five years."

Then there's the President Reagan who signed the president's Budget Message. Here, he acknowledges that we face deficits of $225 to $250 billion under current policies, and that he wants to cut spending by about $240 billion over the next three years to reduce them.

While the president's message does not name any of the "excessive federal benefits" he proposes to eliminate or reduce, David Stockman follows with several hundred pages of painful detail. Strangest of all, there's no mention of "growing our way out" of the deficit. Indeed, Part 3 of the budget explains why it is "highly unlikely" that the economy could grow continuously, without high inflation, at 5 percent per year—i.e., that "added percentage point per year" above the optimistic 4 percent per year assumed in the budget.

Because the president has given such ambivalent signals, there is a real doubt in our land whether a deficit-reduction effort is necessary. The House Budget Committee recently held hearings across the country to find out what the deficit and the president's budget proposals mean to Main Street. Not surprisingly, we found many citizens who were not eager to climb aboard the Spending Cut Special. Many are simply puzzled. If the president's economic program has worked as well as he claims, if indeed we are safely launched on a second American revolution of hope and opportunity, why worry about the deficit?

Main Street's puzzlement and reluctance, of course, is reflected in Congress, especially as spending reduction moves from rhetoric to painfully real choices. If the president is on their side, the supply-side preachers may have their tents filled with eager converts before the economic revival meeting is over. What could be more appealing to a Senate Republican weary of the budget stalemate than a little true economic faith? What could be more appealing to a House Democrat disagreeing strongly with the president's priorities and what surer formula for political stalemate on the budget?

Unfortunately, the reality is this: We're not going to outgrow Reagan's deficits. The evidence of the last several years is compelling. We've now had more than two years of near-record recovery, faster than almost anyone projected. Yet, the deficit has not fallen. Our recession-bloated deficit in 1983 was $195 billion; in more prosperous 1985 we expect $203 billion.

Why? Simply because the Reagan administration's tax and spending policies have produced a *structural* deficit—that part of the deficit not related to economic performance—that rises too rapidly to be submerged by the rising revenues from economic growth. Without the growing structural deficit, the strong economic recovery should have reduced the deficit by about $70 billion in the last two years. However, the structural deficit has expanded at the same time by slightly more than $70 billion, offsetting the effects of recovery.

In the next few years the situation will get worse. As the economic expansion inevitably slows, its deficit-reducing effects are sharply reduced. But the structural deficit just keeps growing, by about $25 billion each year to the end of the decade.

So the problem is real enough, and many of us in the House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, are trying to mobilize our colleagues and the American people to accept the harsh necessity of painful spending cuts.

We need the president's help. We will need his support eventually for a budget that is more fair and balanced than his proposal. But most of all we need his leadership now in explaining to the American people that the deficit problem is real; that we're not going to outgrow it with supply-side hormones; and that the cuts are going to hurt.

□ 1740

The next article on the budget that I think is especially important is an article written by Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, Republican of Iowa, who serves on the Senate Budget Committee. This appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 4, 1985. For those who may not know, Mr. GRASSLEY is one of those in the Senate who has proposed an across-the-board spending freeze. He has joined together with Senators KASSEBAUM, BIDEN, and BAUCUS to propose that kind of a freeze before the Senate and in this article he answers the question, can we realistically freeze military spending as well as other programs? I think the answer is quite enlightening.

Before I get on with reading the article, I will yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. He and I have had occasion to discuss, after a couple of my special orders in the past, and I am very grateful for his keen interest in these matters. I just wanted to interrupt, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

On this question of freeze, I am not one of those that really accepts the fundamental premise upon which apparently the majority of the Democrats, that is, the Democratic membership on the House side, proceeds. I think it is a continuation of the erroneous approach in confronting an individual such as President Ronald Reagan.

The reason I say this is that it goes back to the beginning 4 years ago, and when I saw the thrust of his approach. For example, a freeze to me is really sucking in, as a matter of generalized policy, where you say no matter what, domestic, nondefense or defense, a freeze, because it flies in the face of reality.

I think the basic issue the Democrats have got to decide is whether or not we will continue to be entitled to have the confidence of the American people to continue as the majority party, at least in the House. Certainly we have lost that in the Senate and we have lost that nationally. But what is the reason? I do not attribute it to the fact that the American people are so gullible, they are so easily brainwashed that the massive, skilled PR, the total, obliterative control of the media, the brilliant performance of the President as an actor does it. I think the reason is that the Democrats have accepted the basic Republican fundamental approach which for four decades earned them the minority position, and that was, "Me, too, but not as much."

Now, let us talk about a freeze, and remember that I am speaking here as a sort of a maverick Democrat. I come from the land of Maverick. In fact, my predecessor in Congress from the same district I represent now, the Alamo district, the Alamo is in the center of the 20th Congressional District, was Maury Maverick, Sr., himself, the original Maverick, the great Maury Maverick, Sr., and his son, Maury, Jr., is a great and intimate friend of mine.

But we have got to decide whether or not we really stand up for a basic choice between Republicanism, Reaganism and the burgeoning needs coming from not a frozen country. You know, freeze means death. We freeze dead material. We do not freeze living material, and this country is burgeoning, it is a dynamic people, it is a dynamic country.

If my friend and all of the others advocating a freeze, which apparently the Republicans have joyfully said, "Oh, yes, we are for that," except their definition of a freeze, like the President's definition of a freeze.

Now, my friend, look: The President that is coming in and saying, "Even though you have already cut, and even though I will not stand for any reduction, real reduction in the military spending, I will go along if you call it a freeze, but that does not apply to me."

I have not heard anybody, Democratic Member or Republican, talk about the fact that the President's discretionary budget, in less than 2 years, in fact it coincides with the cutting off of aid by the Congress, direct aid to the Contras in Nicaragua, his discretionary budget has increased exponentially 750 percent. Does that sound like a sincere freezer? Hardly. Why is that not challenged?

If we speak of a freeze, then I say freeze all births in the country. Let us prohibit Americans from being born. And even freeze all necessary human activities like going to the john, because the country is growing while what is called by the big word "infrastructure" is collapsing around our ears. That means sewage lines. That means sewage systems. That means water systems. We have had cities in the Northeast whose entire water system has collapsed around their heads. Our country is dying on the vine, and yet we have a President who has been able to suck us all in; that is, the majority. I am proud to say he has not done that to me. The other day the AP or somebody had some kind of a summary and they showed those least supportive of President Reagan, and I am proud to say that I was there among that less than 3 percent. That is a badge of honor to me, and I will tell you why.

When you ask for a freeze, and you go along, and you accommodate a President, you are sucking in on his ground, you are buying his argument. You will not provide a true freeze on expenditures except the ones he thinks ought to be frozen, and what are those? They are the 1,700, young men and young ladies in my district who last year were not able to go to college because this President and the majority of the Congress scaled back enormously the student loan aid, 1,700.

Now here is the same President who has generated a war psychosis against Russia and paints Russia as the dreaded, moral enemy of America. But never once stops to ask how a country that just 50 years ago was sunk in peasantry can emerge today and outproduce us in petroleum, can come in and produce such things as, in 1957, I was filibustering a cold October night the race bills of that day, when the spectacular news swept the United States that the Russians had put up sputnik. That was 1957, October. Then, and not until then, and 6 months later did the Congress pass the Defense Education Act. Up to that time what had been considered, oh, improper invasion by the Federal Government, oh, socialistic, was suddenly approved, the Defense Education Act, national education programs, but only for what? To produce engineers, because the Look magazine and the Life magazine of that day had full-page pictures showing American kids dancing, the rock and roll was the urge then, just rocking and rolling, and then they had a full-page picture of Russian students of equivalent age, big mathematical geniuses before a blackboard with big calculus symbols, which, of course, was ridiculous and untrue and unfaithful and a distrust of America's true nature.

The point is that when the Russians put up sputnik in 1957, that was the end of the 17th year program. They called it the 17th year plan. What was that plan? That plan was to provide education for any Russian, young, old, middle-aged, factory worker, student or what have you, to have a chance to go free of charge from the lowest to the highest grades of education in Russia. At the end of that 17th year was when they put up sputnik.

Meanwhile, we have a President who says we are going to develop the most spectacular, the end-it-all mechanism that is going to give us supremacy in defense, the so-called star wars, which are based on the most sophisticated knowledge man has developed, but reducing the ability of our young to produce that skilled and knowledgeable manpower because he is asking for a reduction in the opportunities that will give education to the average American young man or young woman.

□ 1750

In my district 1,700 minds that can be creative forces in our community cannot go to college as of last year because President Reagan talked about not a freeze but a reduction and a freeze. So I say to my friend I do not mean to be critical. I am just expounding on my thinking.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas. I simply want to acknowledge his points concerning the priorities.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. MOAKLEY. It is very important. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I know why the gentleman is here, and I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 239 AND H.R. 2068

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file two privileged reports, a report on House Joint Resolution 239 and report on H.R. 2068.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, I simply want to acknowledge the point the gentleman from Texas made about the priorities that are a part of the current budget deficit, and by freezing those priorities the gentleman's argument is that we lock in place priorities that are not paying attention to some of these crucial needs in our society like education and the rest.

GONZALEZ. That is right.

Mr. PENNY. I do not quarrel with the point the gentleman made and the need, I think, to invest in those areas. My point on holding the line on spending across the board is that it is the best way in my view to get a handle on the deficit and to stop those priorities from becoming further skewed in future years, and, of course, they will if we continue to increase certain parts of the budget like the military by 8 percent. When other portions of the budget are reduced to offset that kind of increase, then problems only get magnified in future years.

It is for that reason that I think it is really in our best interest for the time being to put a lid on spending across the board to hold the line on these deficits, but, by the same token, to stop that kind of a shift in priorities from continuing away from some of these areas which are really an investment in our future.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. But here is a fact: As Abraham Lincoln said, if we do not know whither we are headed, we cannot figure out the road to follow.

If we refuse to understand the cause for what the President says is now built-in, monstrous deficits for the foreseeable fiscal future, no less than 3 fiscal years, what good does it do to offer this kind of a palliative, which is not a palliative at all because it is based on assumptions that are not valid? For example, just the incremental in the prime interest rate in just the last 3 months has eroded half of the proceeds of revenues from the last so-called tax measure, or what they call the tax equity measure, and what I am saying is that the basic assumption that the President is predicating it on is one based on blight, on a giant, suffocating blanket of blight on a country that is still dynamic, a country that is still growing.

Our country has not reached the point or the pinnacle of absorption of growth. It is a dynamic country, and I do not care what the President says or the majority of Congress says, nobody is going to straitjacket this country. The only thing that can happen is that we have built in such great abnormalities.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, may I reclaim my time?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that. As I understand it, I have only about 8 minutes left in my special order, and I am not positive whether this article from the Senator from Iowa is going to take that long to read, but I want to make sure I get this submitted for the RECORD.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for his generosity in allowing me to participate.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for his interest and for his comments.

Madam Speaker, the article is entitled "A Freeze Is Just What the Pentagon Needs." Again it is an article written by Mr. GRASSLEY because Mr. GRASSLEY is a Member of the other body, a Senator from Iowa and a member of the Budget Committee and is a cosponsor of an across-the-board spending freeze. This article appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 4, 1985. Again it is entitled "A Freeze Is Just What the Pentagon Needs," and Mr. GRASSLEY writes as follows:

Those who argue that the defense budget cannot be frozen actually show why it should be frozen. Their argument is that Congress has tied its own hands; that we are unconditionally bound by past decisions; that we must pour more and more fertilizer on mushrooms we planted the past four years.

It is precisely this kind of budget rigidity that a freeze addresses. Budget rigidity is a result of poor management. We have experienced this problem for the past decade with entitlement programs, where cost of living adjustments and other benefits grow automatically. The defense budget has, in effect, become the nation's largest entitlement program, and has nursed a new generation of welfare queens: the defense industry.

A budget freeze is intended as an abrupt change in policy to highlight the fact that spending is not an act of nature, but a conscious act of Congress. Its application must be to defense and non-defense spending alike. Provided, that is, it can be demonstrated that a defense freeze will not weaken the security of the nation. The argument that follows proves this contention beyond a shadow of a doubt.

BUYING HIGHER COSTS

Not only is a defense freeze necessary to reduce the federal deficit, it is essential to prevent a further erosion of our military capability. Those who have argued for increased defense budgets have failed to recognize that recently increased defense budgets have actually bought high costs and overhead rather than more tanks, ships and planes. Given the disappointing returns from recent unprecedented defense budget growth, it is evident that fundamentally improved management will yield far greater returns than budget increases. A budget freeze is the first step toward defense management reform.

Over the last four years, the defense budget has grown from $211 billion in fiscal 1982 to $292 billion in 1985, a 39% growth rate in current dollars and 22% in constant dollars. This growth is unprecedented in the post-World War II era. As the accompanying table shows, the last four appropriations exceed, in constant dollars, the four most costly years of the Korean and Vietnam wars. More important, the table shows that the cumulative effect of a hypothetical four-year freeze at today's levels would exceed the cumulative expenditures of the last four years by 10% in constant dollars. In short, the defense budget would be frozen at a very high level.

The stated aim of the growth in the defense budget has been to enlarge, to modernize and to improve the readiness of our conventional forces. However, when comparing the output derived from the recent budget growth with the output of the previous periods we find that, notwithstanding unprecedented budget increases, changes and improvements have been minimal at best. In fact, there has been little evidence of force modernization; in many cases fewer quantities have been produced at higher costs, and readiness improvements have been marginal. In short, increases in output have not been proportional to increases in input.

This input vs. output problem is illustrated by the case of aircraft procurement. Taken together, the Air Force and Navy aircraft procurement budgets amounted to 36% of the total Defense Department procurement budget between fiscal 1982 and fiscal 1985. In spite of a constant-dollar, four-year budget increase of 75% above that of the Carter administration, 11% fewer airplanes were procured.

Similarly, in the case of Navy ship construction, major surface combatants decreased 17% from the Carter years despite a 47% increase in funds—in constant dollars. Even when procurement quantities increase, as in the case of key weapons and tracked vehicle procurements in the Army, they increase at a much slower rate than procurement budgets. For example, the number of tanks increased 30% and helicopters 45% from the Carter years. But their budgets increased 85% in constant dollars, indicating growing unit costs. The unit cost is supposed to decline as production rates increase. This obviously has not been the case. Simply put, we are buying fewer weapons for considerably more.

As with procurement, more money has failed to solve the readiness problem. With the exception of improved personnel recruitment and retention rates, improvements in readiness have not been proportional to the increased resources appropriated over the four years. Total funding for Operations and Maintenance in the past four years increased 25% from the previous four years in constant dollars. Furthermore, Congress appropriated more O&M funds in the last four years than the four largest O&M budgets in either the Korean War ('51-54) or the Vietnam War ('67-70). In both wars we were operating larger forces at much higher operational tempo, and we were absorbing significant equipment losses.

Despite the 25% increase in O&M appropriations, training tempos are not significantly different from those of the previous four years. For instance, Army monthly flying hours per crew have fallen from 18.8

hours in fiscal 1980 to 16.4 hours in fiscal 1984; Navy quarterly steaming days per ship have risen only slightly, from 32.4 days in fiscal 1980 to 34.9 days in fiscal 1984; and Navy monthly flying hours per crew have fallen from 24.2 hours in fiscal 1980 to 23.7 hours in fiscal 1984.

Finally, despite these relatively constant training tempos, the 25% increase in the constant dollar O&M budget of the last four years has *not* resulted in major improvements in materiel readiness as measured by the mission capable (MC) or fully mission capable (FMC) rates, according to a May 1984 Pentagon report to the Senate Armed Services Committee. The report points out that the increased operating costs of the more complex equipment entering our inventory is a major cause of this disturbing state of affairs. This problem will compound itself in the future as more and more new weapons systems come on line.

Given these input/output disasters in both procurement and readiness, one wonders where the bulk of the unprecedented budget growth has gone. The answer is high costs and overhead. Startling evidence of this has recently been gathered by Congress. The evidence shows we may be spending up to 18 times more for our weapons systems than defense contractors' own data suggest we should pay for in-house factory work, if their plants were run at normal factory efficiency.

For example, we paid one major defense company working on the MX missile for 5,050 direct labor hours when its own factory efficiency data say the same work should take only 370 hours. That means we pay for 7% factory efficiency on work done by that contractor. This example is by no means unique. We have been paying for enough work for 17 Maverick missiles but getting only one.

When factors other than labor are considered, we have paid more than $600 per standard hour for the kind of work that is normally done in the private sector for $40 to $60. Other such examples throughout the defense industry are common. Some are better, some are worse. What is clear is that this problem is pervasive.

This egregious situation can occur only because competition is alien to the defense world. Only 5% of all defense dollars are truly competitive; the rest are negotiated. It is the negotiated contracts that are responsible for allowing huge variances between standard hours and actual incurred hours for work done in defense manufacturing plants. These variances primarily result from three factors: (1) scrap and rework due to poor quality control; (2) labor inefficiency due to poor management, and (3) continuous design changes due to poor planning. The extent to which each of these contributes to overall inefficiency varies with each system.

Congress and the public suspected the inefficiency problem in the defense industry was bad when examples surfaced such as $1,000 stool caps or $7,000 coffee makers. These were explained away by the Pentagon as "accounting quirks." The argument was that overhead is evenly allocated to each item the department buys. This argument has since been diffused because the Pentagon cannot produce a single example to support the contention. The fact is, defense industry overhead is enormous, the magnitude of which measures the industry's inefficiency. Rhetoric to the contrary is no longer sufficient to deflect public and congressional scrutiny.

FACTORY EFFICIENCY OF 5%

Congress, in fact, has begun to systematically uncover cost data on defense manufacturers' factory performance. Some of the data have surfaced recently at congressional hearings. The figures show factory efficiency as low as 5%. That is no typographical error. Five percent efficiency, for certain in-house work. This can happen only because competition is nonexistent. We are, in effect, subsidizing overhead. As we conservatives say, if you subsidize something, you get more of it. To claim, then, that more money is needed for the defense budget in light of this appalling situation makes as much sense as the prices we are paying for our defense.

The facts in my arguments come from the Pentagon itself. They graph the performance of the department over the past four years, and reveal a systematic weakening of our military at an ever-increasing cost. That is why I believe the Congress this year will ignore the cries of a bureaucracy whose performance is as poor as the one described here. We will politely listen to all the threats from the defense community, and then give the department a budget it desperately needs—a freeze.

□ 1800

NICARAGUA: A REPORT BY WESLEY R. SMITH AND RICHARD H. RYGG

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Madam Speaker, on April 4, 1985, two young men by the name of Wesley R. Smith and Richard Rygg compiled a report written by Wesley R. Smith on the status of conditions relating to human rights violations in Nicaragua.

Wesley Smith and Richard Rygg conducted the interviews presented in this report. They speak fluent Spanish and each has experience working with farmers and peasants in Latin America. The Nicaraguan refugee populations in Costa Rica and Honduras are largely comprised of farmers and peasants.

Wesley Smith is a 23-year-old senior studying international relations at Brigham Young University. He served as a missionary to Spanish speaking people in Argentina and Arizona.

From May 1, 1984, to July 15, 1984, Wes worked as an intern in Costa Rica for the newspaper La Nacion Internacional. The interviews appearing in this report from Costa Rica were conducted by him at this time. He was in Nicaragua from December 14, 1984, to January 13, 1985, interviewing.

Richard Rygg is 28 years old and will receive his MBA from Pennsylvania State University in June 1985. He served as a missionary in Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Honduras from 1977-79. His work involved extensive interaction with the Nicaraguan peasantry and middle class.

Both of these students visited Honduras from March 4 to March 16. While there they visited the refugee areas of Teupasenti, Roos Roos, Danli, El Paraiso, Jacaleapa, El Triunfo, and Cholutecs. They funded their own trip to Honduras.

The report follows:

INTRODUCTION

This report emanates from a compilation of interviews conducted in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Honduras during 1984-1985. During this time period over 250 Nicaraguans, inside as well as outside Nicaragua, were interviewed. The few interviews and stories selected for this report are representative of the majority of the people we spoke with during our visits.

We did not go to Central America looking specifically for evidence in support of one side or the other. Rather, we wanted to speak with individuals that represented that majority which wears neither the Sandinista nor the Contra uniform. Our main purpose was to find out what the Nicaraguan people had experienced and why so many people were fleeing their country.

Those people interviewed within the refugee camps were randomly selected to insure a representative statistic of all the refugees within those camps. In speaking with the Nicaraguan people we worked in conjunction with no one else—no ecclesiastical authorities, government agencies, human rights organizations, or international groups. This unobtrusive approach allowed us access to information which, according to those refugees interviewed, generally is not expressed by them.

In publishing this report we are not endorsing either side of the conflict. The stories, feelings, and opinions of the Nicaraguans represented here are not in favor of the Sandinistas. However, this is not a deliberate attempt by us to show only one side of the story. In this report we have simply compiled the stories of the Nicaraguan people that represent the groups we talked with.

We were asked by most of the people we spoke with not to reveal their names for fear of reprisal. Therefore we have substituted most names, but we will be glad to furnish the real names to responsible reporters who will not jeopardize these peope's safety. They took us into their confidence and we are obligated to respect their wishes.

NOTE.—The questions of international law are not examined in this report although we address the abuses which have arisen because of the internal conflict in Nicaragua between the Sandinistas and the Contras.

FINDINGS

Contras

We have no evidence on the Misura nor the Misurasata because there was not enough time in those areas to investigate the truthfulness of the reports received.

In interviewing refugees, many of which were inside Sandinista controlled areas like Managua, Matagalpa, and Leon, Wes could find no specific incidents of Contra atrocities. He did interview with Sandinistas involved in the conflict. They told him of Contra atrocities in general but did not supply any specific instances or relate any personal experiences.

The refugees interviewed mentioned some civilians were killed as Sandinista and Contra forces fought in the mountains.

No accusations were received which spoke of Contra forces intentionally killing, torturing, or raping civilians or Sandinista war

prisoners in fact, almost the opposite was true. Of those Nicaraguans who spoke of civilians being killed, nearly all mentioned that only Sandinistas were participating in such activities—indiscriminate bombing, shootings, torture, etc.

The Nicaraguans interviewed said their attitudes toward the Contra forces had changed during the last 2 years. According to statements, the towns in which they lived did not support or sympathize with the Contra movements in 1981-82. Although no specific reasons were given they referred to the Contras as rebels and most said they had been indifferent to their existence during this early period.

However, those interviewed said their feelings toward the Contras changed and they now sympathized with the Contra movement. They mentioned how after 1982 the Contras stopped their abusive tactics. In addition, they explained that the Sandinista policy of land reform, especially among the peasants, religious persecution, and repression of those who did not support the Sandinista process, were factors causing them to now sympathize with the Contras. One young boy told us that, "the Contras had problems before because they robbed a lot and killed people. Now they're part of the people."

About 20 percent interviewed felt that they had been caught in a cross fire between Sandinistas and Contras and had not sided with either one. These people said they began sympathizing with the Contras when the Sandinista policies became too repressive for them.

While in Nicaragua Wes interviewed several Sandinistas including those from the Juventud Sandinista 19 de Julio. Their feelings about the conflict were generally the same. One Sandinista Youth leader in Leon was interviewed and although she mentioned no specific cases, her feelings represent those of other Sandinistas interviewed in Managua, Matagalpa, and Leon.

"We know about the aggression of the United States and of President Ronald Reagan. The mercenaries (Contras), we know that they come, not only to make money but to burn farms, schools, and kidnap peasants. Over 70 percent of the youth are involved in Sandinista organizations. The Contras are ex[Samoza] guards."

Sandinistas

Evidence gathered during these three visits points to a systematic process of human rights abuses conducted by the Sandinista government against the Nicaraguan people including those who have taken up armed resistance against the Sandinista government. The abuses reported to us or witnessed by us personally, fall under the following categories.

Forced recruitment of Nicaraguan youth by the Sandinista militay.

Religious persecution.

Indiscriminate shelling of villages.

Mistreatment of prisoners.

Forced volunteerism in the coop system.

Repression of the opposition.

FORCED MILITARY RECRUITMENT

In the last six months forced recruitment of youths by the military has increased dramatically. We received numerous accounts of young men being forcefully taken from their homes, local theatres, discoteques and parks. These stories were from eyewitness accounts and from young boys who had been taken but released or who deserted. Some boys as young as 14 have been taken by the military.

While in Nicaragua Wes witnessed one such incident in the town of Nagarote. He arrived at the town at about 11 a.m. Two young girls snuck him through some back roads. While there he spoke to 15 people who related their story to him and saw 10 people who had been beaten by the military. One man received a severe gash. A "mobster" wearing a military uniform had entered his home, and struck him with the end of a hoe.

A 14 year old girl, Eliana Mejilla, described to Wes what had happened earlier that morning.

"At 6:30 a.m. on 27 December 1984 the Sandinista military arrived on the outskirts of town. They came in 2 IFA troop transports and about 15 jeep with the yellow triangle insignia "Prevencion" sprayed on the side. When they started rounding up the young boys from the streets and the parks the people organized themselves. The Catholic father sounded the church bells and the people built barricades on the streets leading into the center of town.

"The Sandinista soldiers beat those families members who resisted the military when they forced themselves into the homes. After the barricades were broken down the military sent in two IFA trucks. Half of the mobsters in those trucks were military soliders who had laid down their weapons outside the town and had replaced them with clubs. Only three boys had been taken but 47 adults were taken prisoners for "counterrevolutionary" activities. The people who resisted the military were not armed Contras but strictly civilians. Around 40 people received injuries from being struck by the military soldiers. Then the mobs returned in two IFA military trucks, broke into a house facing the TelCor office and burned a jeep."

While in Honduras we spoke to a group of 35 Nicaraguan youth who had come across the border several weeks before. They said they had fled Nicaragua because of the military draft. Several had already served in the Sandinista military and had deserted, while others had gone into hiding inside Nicaragua to avoid the military draft. Many of these youth had been imprisoned for not joining the servicio patriotico [patriotic service].

Andres Cornejo was inscripted into the military on 15 January 1985 and deserted one month later. He describes the treatment while in the military.

"The Sandinistas grabbed me on 15 January 1985. I was in the training camp called San Gabriel. While there we [those inscripted] were constantly threatened by our Cuban advisers that if we tried to desert there was a good chance we might get "shot" or thrown in prison or be taken to the most dangerous zones where there was no escape. I was there for one month and then was transferred to the base called Oscar Curos. From there I deserted and came across the border."

NOTE.—All those interviewed who had been imprisoned or served in the military spoke of Cuban advisors which worked in the prisons and within the military system. In asking these Nicaraguans how they knew they were Cubans they gave similar reports: the accent; phrases such as "tu chico"; their mannerisms; and even the type of cigarettes they smoke, etc. One Nicaraguan who spent 16 months in prison told me, "we as Nicaraguans know our own people and we have seen enough Cubans to know who they are and how they act."

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The groups most hard hit by systematic persecution of religion in the northern regions of the country are the Pentacostals and Evangeicals. According to their reports their practice of individuality and belief in God has created friction between them and the government.

A peasant living in the northern zone of San Jose described the religious persecution he received from the Sandinistas.

"I have been serving God for 7 years in the Pentacostal church, Assembly of God. I was preaching in the fields and was persecuted. I have been imprisoned three times for preaching the gospel. I don't know what it is like to take up arms but when they had me they threatened to kill me if I didn't join the military. You were forced to take arms and this pressure happened all over the zone where I lived. In that area they gave me 8 days to decide whether to fight or disappear. We didn't have any other choice but to flee. We were in the mountains for 18 days before arriving in Honduras."

Two other families that fled with him across the border were in the same camp and substantiated the story he gave.

Lidia Herrera and her two children Maritza and Jose Alberto, were victims to a Sandinista attack during a prayer meeting on 7 February 1985. The following is their story:

"We were praying during a religious meeting when we heard bullet shots from outside. When we heard the shots we continued praying and then a member of the Sandinista military entered the house and told us to stay inside or we would be shot. The Sandinista then left the house and we continued praying and heard a rain of bullets. When we looked around seven people were dead and three were wounded. One of the dead was my son Jose Alberto. He had been hit in the face with bullets. The Contras hadn't been in that area that day. In fact we hadn't seen them for a long time."

These peasants not willing to take up arms are branded as counterrevolutionaries. Many peasants testified that they had been imprisoned and tortured for their religious beliefs. Gerrardo Bustomonte also received persecution by the Sandinistas for his religious beliefs.

"The Sandinistas had called me into the prison and then they accused me of working with the counterrevolution. They asked me how I could preach the "message" and be a counterrevolutionary since Christ himself was a revolutionary. They told me I was going to tell them the truth. They put a .45 pistol here [motioning to the temple] and said, "you are going to tell us the truth that you are a contra and that you collaborate with the contra. You're a contra because you won't take up arms.

"He then hit me in the chest and let me free. Before I left he told me that if he caught me working the counterrevolution he would eliminate me. He then said that according to them the counterrevolution was preaching the Word of God. Even if you don't have any arms they accuse you of being a contra if you're not willing to take up arms."

MISTREATMENT OF PRISONERS

It should be noted that many of the prisons in Nicaragua are clandestine and known only to those who have experienced them. They are nick-named by the Nicaraguan prisoners that know of them. The prison names used in this report are those mentioned repeatedly by the Nicaraguan people interviewed.

The prison system in NIcaragua is supplied by the Judicial system which is run by the Sandinista party. Those who have been imprisoned speak of tortures and abuses of human rights. While in prison they receive insufficient clothing, food, and medical attention.

In many instances prisoners, over 90 percent of whom are peasant farmers were forced to make confessions, then tried and sentenced because of these confessions.

The following are torture methods used on prisoners.

Water is dropped on their heads for days at a time.

Light deprivation.

Interrogations in the middle of the night.

Beatings with sticks wrapped in wet towels.

Guards using boxing gloves repeatedly beat prisoners.

Sleep deprivation.

In the northern provinces prisoners are put in tubs of cold water for extended periods of time.

Hanging by the wrists.

Isolation from any human contact.

Forcing prisoners into cells where they cannot sit down or stand up completely.

There were repeated testimonies of this occuring in the Department of Chontales, City of Juigalpa.

The Permanent Commission of Human Rights of Nicaragua (CPDH)

The CPDH receives testimonies from people who were imprisoned and then set free or had finished their sentencing. It estimates it only receives 10 percent of the total incidences of human rights violations. In order for the CPDH to process accusations the victims must supply names and residences. Because of fear of retribution people are afraid to give this information.

Wes conducted several interviews in December 1984 and January 1985 with Lino Hernandez, one of the directors of the CPDH.

From testimonies and evidence gathered, the CPDH estimates that over 95 percent of those convicted by the Popular Anti-Somoza Tribunals were convicted by accusations against themselves while in State Security prisons. Of that 95 percent nearly all have been tortured into accusing themselves. On the average, those accused spend more than 6 months in prison before coming before the Tribunals. Those brought before the Tribunals are condemned by evidence gathered in three ways:

1. Confessions of prisoners against themselves while in State Security cells.

2. Confessions of prisoners against other prisoners.

3. Testimony of State Security guards who heard prisoners confessions during interrogations.

In the majority of the cases the peasants were accused of giving food or logistical aid to the contras. The following part of an interview with Lino Hernandez of the CPDH in January 1985.

"In principal every person that arrives at the State Security prisons is declared guilty. They have a method for each person. We have received testimonies of tortures that don't leave marks or scars. While in State Security they are subject to isolation in dark cells without any light. They are not given food either. We have received information that they use both physical and psychological torture."

Wes interviewed Ramon Melendez in Managua, January 1985. Wes was referred to him by the OPDH. Ramon was released from prison in November 1984. He spent 17 months in prison. He was accused of counterrevolutionary activities. His story follows:

"I was sleeping in my house at 5 a.m. when eight guys arrived with machine guns. They pushed the doorbell and the maid let them in. They took me to the State Security [behind the Hotel Intercontinental] and placed me in cell number 18. I entered the cell and you couldn't see anything. There was only light when they opened the door to interrogate me. I spent 96 days in that cell. I got a skin fungus on my feet and all my hair fell out, because in the interrogations the Sandinista grabbed me by the hair and told me 'you're going to talk or else', and when he did this the hair stayed in his hand.

"After being imprisoned for five days they showed me my wife at the other end of the hall wearing a prisoners uniform. They quickly put me back into the cell and from that day on they told me that my wife was dying. I heard my wife saying 'my love, I can't stand it anymore. I'm dying My children'. It must have been a tape recorder or another woman because my wife was only in jail for one day but they made me believe she was in jail permanently. In my cell I could only imagine the days passing, because in there I didn't know if it was night or day."

Ramon spent 3 months in solitary confinement and six months in a cell with other prisoners. While in El Chipote they told him if he signed a confession his wife would be released. State Security then condemned him with his own accusation. He was given 7 years imprisonment at his first trial, but the appellate court raised it to 15 years. The Sandinistas said he deserved the extra 8 years for complaining to the human rights commission that they, the Sandinistas, were torturing him. He was later transferred to the prison called "Zona Franca" near the Managua International Airport. He said there were over 800 political prisoners in the "Zona Franca" and he estimated thousands are being held in other clandestine prisons within the country. He spoke with hundreds of prisoners that had been transferred from outlying areas into the Zona Franca.

Several defense lawyers that were interviewed in Managua also estimate there are thousands of unaccounted for Nicaraguans who have become victims of the clandestine prison system in Nicaragua.

Rogelio Benavides is 33 years old, from Ocotal, Santa Clara. He describes his treatment while in prison. He was accused of hiding arms for the counterrevolutionaries.

"On 20 March 1984 they took me from my house in Santa Caira at midnight and took me to Ocotal. I was in prison for three months. They investigated [interrogated] us. At night they bathed [soaked] us with cold water. For eight hours we had to stand up soaking wet. They stuck us in [the water] and soaked us and then investigated [interrogated] us. It was painful and we always got out trembling. We were many. They did it the first time to interrogate us. The interrogater asked us where we had the arms. They made me take off my shirt, pants and underwear. The next day they stuck us in again. I left the prison with pnuenomnia."

Pedro Ruiz Alfaro left Nicaragua on 16 January 1985 with his wife and two children. He spent 1 year in Esteli in a prison called "La Barranoa" from July 1983-84. The Sandinistas then transferred him to Chinandega where he was kept in "El Penal" and released him four months later in November 1984.

"I was accused of hiding arms for the counterrevolutionaries inside my house. They brought me before the Anti-Somoza tribunals in Esteli. I had several witnesses which defended me but it didn't matter because they had their frogs [informants] from the CDS [Sandinista Defense Committee] which accused me. The two CDS members were Amado Arados and Dela Segovia. They searched the house and found nothing, but they accused me anyway.

"While in prison several Cuban and Nicaraguan guards tortured me. After being there for two weeks they injected me two times, with a yellow fluid. With these injections I felt like running, yelling and crying. I laid on the floor and trembled. They placed a small tape recorder next to my mouth but didn't ask me any questions. The next day they gave me a second injection much more powerful than the first. They interrogated me around 20 to 30 times. The Cubans would put a pistol to your head called a "Macaron" until you confessed you were a contra. When I was transfered to Chinandega they treated me with more consideration."

The CPDH has investigated several reports of prisoners shot while trying to "escape". These investigations have shown that many of these prisoners were tortured before they were killed. Similar reports obtained during our investigations substantiate these claims. The following story was provided by the CPDH.

"Jose Esteban Lazo Morales (correct name), 39 years old is from Chontales. He was captured 14 November 1983 in San Pedro de Lovago and was taken to the State Security prison in Juigalpa. Four days later he was taken to his home in a coffin which had been sealed with screws. They told the family that they couldn't open the coffin because it would be a health hazard and they would have to bury him immediately at sunrise.

"When State Security left, the family opened the coffin. Jose had a fractured nose, and bruises covering his face. His head and ears were bleeding, his ribs were broken and his genitals were badly bruised. He had been knifed in the back many times which left marks in the shape of a half moon. When State Security found out the family had opened the coffin they sent a forensics doctor to check him out. He diagnosed Jose as having died of a heart attack. They told the Sandinistas that he was bruised on the forehead after falling while showering. And that his nose was fractured because he had fainted and fallen on his face."

Felipe Hidalgo was in prison from March 1982 to September 1982. He told us the following story.

"I first spent two nights in the prison in Jalapa. I was then in Ocotal for 15 days and from there was transferred to La Barranca in Esteli for 45 days. The last four months I spent time in a prison in Esteli called 19 de Julio". In Jalapa they hung me over an open sewer because I didn't obey them. There were eleven of us there. All 11 were transferred from Jalapa to Octogal in the middle of the night. While in route, three of the prisoners were taken out and carried down to the side of the road. The first one lowered from the truck was Eduardo Herra Bustamante. I knew him because he was from a small town near Limon. The next one lowered from the truck was a photographer from Jalapa named Fidel Gabona. He already had a broken arm from before. The

third one was Eriberto Gonzalez. He was from the aldea called Sante Barbara."

Felipe said he learned that these three had been killed because when he was released from prison shortly after his prison transfer his family told him that the Sandinistas said the three had been found in the mountains with their throats slit. Family members said the Sandinistas had blamed the contras for the massacre. He said the story had been written up in La Barricada as a contra massacre.

Pedro Ruiz Alfaro (see story above) is from Esteli and left Nicaragua 16 January 1985. From July 83 to July 84 he was in "La Barranca" prison in Esteli. From there he was transferred to El Penal in Chinandego and was released in November 1984. The following is his story.

"Two weeks after leaving prison in Chinandega I started to work driving a sand truck with two other helpers on the road that leads out of Maouelizo. When we arrived at the river near Maouelizo we left the truck and started searching for sand down by the river. While there we ran across a shallow grave, what we call an aguacera. To us an aguacera is where they kill people. In this aguacera were two men I knew from San Fernando. We calculate there were from 50 to 60 bodies but I could identify only two. I recognized the two because their faces where only bloated. The rest I didn't recognize because their faces were all bruised. They had been with me in La Barranca. The Sandinistas took me out [to Chinandega] but these two men stayed. After I saw them dead I returned and told the families of the dead men. They said they had gone to the Barranca only a few days earlier and the Sandinistas told the families they were no longer there in prison."

Ismael Herrera, a 55 year old farmer from Mora, Nueva Segovia left Nicaragua 5 November 1983. He was imprisoned in April 1983 in the prison La Barranca.

"They put me in jail because one of my sons had joined the counterrevolutionary forces. They put me in a small cell and all I could see was darkness—no light. It felt like you were being hit in the heart every time they came by to take you out of the cell. You feared, because you thought they would take you out to kill you. I know they killed some because they would investigate [interrogate] people at midnight and some never returned. They grabbed me by the hair and put a knife in my throat and an AK in my kidneys and kicked me. They did this so I would say I had been helping the contras. If I had told them that, they would have killed me."

In addition to the mistreatment of civilian prisoners many refugees and people still living in Nicaragua reported incidents of mistreatment of contra prisoners and Sandinista deserters.

A nurse stationed in a Zone called "La Guinea" described an incident with a contra prisoner. She was in a place called "La Fonseca" near Verdun in September 1983 when this occurred.

"I was stationed in this town in the health center when one day they [the Sandinistas] captured a contra boy up in the mountains. They brought him into town behind a horse. The boy was wearing a blue outfit and didn't have any shoes on. He was blindfolded and had his hands tied behind his back.

"They took him to the town square where I was stationed by the health center. There, the Sandinistas shot off their AK 47's and when they did that the horse took off running. The boy was tied to the horse and it dragged him away—tied and bound. The rope then hit a rock and tore. The boy just laid their on the ground badly beaten. They then took the boy and tied him onto a horse that had arms and took him out of the town. The whole town saw this happen."

Luiz Payan is a 37 year old farmer from Jicaro. He witnessed a similar treatment in his home town in November 1983.

"They captured a commander there in Jicaro. He was the one they tortured after he was dead. They spit on his face and stabbed him with a bayonet. They paraded him around the city tied to the fender of their car. The whole town saw it and they almost made me go out and trample on the commando myself. This happened at about 9 a.m. and they called all the people out into the plaza and told us this is what would happen to people who fought against the Sandinistas."

Indiscriminate imprisonment

In the last half of 1984 forced military recruitment increased rapidly. With this conscription came an increase in indiscriminate imprisonment and detainment of youth which appeared to be within the qualified age limit. While in Managua Wes spoke with youth who had been detained by the military longer than 24 hours. In many instances family members don't know the location of their children until they are released.

Salomon Calvo Arrieta is a lawyer in Managua and worked as correspondent for the Costa Rican radio "Impacto". While in Nicaragua Wes investigated the case of his imprisonment thoroughly.

"Salomon was imprisoned 29 December 1984. Two days before his imprisonment he broadcast information about the insurrection in Nagarote which occurred on 27 December 1984. He was taken from his home at 8 p.m. and carried to the military complex called "El Chipote". For the first three days his wife attemped to visit her husband and find the reason for his imprisonment. She was told they weren't sure what law he had exactly broken but it had something to do with "counterrevolutionary" activities. His wife and Wes visited him in prison on 5 January 1985. He was still incommunicado and the authorities would not permit the visit. They accused him of supplying false information about the insurrection in Nagarote—saying that the insurrection hadn't occurred when it actually had. When the international press received the Nagarote story the State Security then accused Salomon of paying money to Manuel Urbina to exile himself in the Costa Rican Embassy in Managua."

INDISCRIMINATE SHELLING OF VILLAGES

Refugees not involved in the conflict but living within the war zones have come under repeated attacks by the Sandinistas. The Sandinistas indiscriminately use artillery against civilian population areas in the Segovias mountain region and have done so along the southern border as well.

Since July 1984 to as late as February 1985 the area around and including "Los Harrados" has come under heavy artillery fire at least 5 times. In the first week in January 1985 a man, Donald Lario, was killed when a mortar fell on his house. The account of Sandinista bombing and mortaring of civilian areas were taken from eight different people in three different refugee camps. Their stories coincide with each other on the shelling incidents although the number of bombings reported ranged from 5 to 7. One specific bombardment was reported by Christina Mariana Reyes. She left her home in Los Harrados near Monsonte, Department of Nueva Segovia on 21 February 1985.

"My own people have been bombed five times in our community. They say the contras are living there but that is not true. It is true they have passed by our way before but, it has been months since they did that. My nephew was killed in December when a mortar fell through his house. They mortared us from the town of Monsonte. The people protested but they would not listen to us. On my way to Ocotal I saw the cannons from where they fired at us."

In August 1984 in an area near "Los Harrados" the Sandinistas bombarded several areas from their bases in "Plan de Gramma" and a place called "La Joba". Ramos Portocarrero Sirias is from Jinotega, residence of Laguna Verde, Jurisdiction of Wiwili. He left Nicaragua in October 1984 after his community was mortared by the Sandinistas. His story was supported by 3 other refugees not related to him.

"We are talking about a bombing which happened in August 1984 that left the valley all burned. We know it was the Sandinistas because we, the peasants, are united and we communicate with one another. We know where the Sandinistas are and what they're doing. The place [where they bombed] is called Laguna Verde and about 6 or 7 powerful grenades were thrown. They have a high powered rocket launcher, mortars and cannons. The bombs came from "La Joba", a place close to Wiwili in Jinotega. There are about 20 houses there and they are pretty spread out. In Plan de Gramma they [the Sandinistas] have a base and they also mortared from that area. It is located about 4 kilometers from Laguna Verde."

Felix Monteguello is from Laguna Verde and left that community in November, 1984. He fled because one of the shells dropped on his ranch and burned it. His ranch was located in El Triunfo, an area close to Laguna Verde. His story supported the testimony given by Alejandro Jordian Bucardo.

REPRESSION OF THE OPPOSITION

Many of those interviewed said they had been accused of counterrevolutionery activities simply because they didn't support the Sandinista political process. This would include absence from DDS meetings, weekly vigilance duty, absence from participating in the cotton and coffee harvest and from attending revolutionary rallies. Those involved in political and civic opposition groups have come under increased persecution by the "divine mobs" and paramilitary groups supported by the Sandinistas.

Guadalupe Castellanos is from the town of Dipilto, Nueva Segovia. [She permitted the release of her real name since she no longer has any family in Nicaragua.] She left Nicaragua in April 1984 after recovering from grenade wounds to her back and arm.

"I went to church a few days before Christmas in 1983 and there was a State Security man named Manuel Martinez who was there preaching to us. He said we had to have a bible in one hand and a rifle in the other so that the revolution would be successful. I had an argument with him and then went to cut coffee with my two children.

"They came with me because as poor people one needs to work hard for a living and they were small so they accompanied

me. We were let off work at midday since the next day was December 24. I stayed to gather big leaves at the bottom of the gulley so I could make a Christmas decoration for my children. While in the gulley I ran into some Piri who were still there guarding the coffee fields. They started harassing me and tried to grab me but I ran away from them for a short distance. They then caught up to me and started beating me. I told my two children to run up the mountain and catch up with the other group of coffee pickers that had already left.

"After the Sandinistas beat me they left me there and went off a little way. Maybe they thought I was dead or they were just waiting to see if my sons would return to help me. I'm not sure, but what I am sure of is that I got up and started running up the hill to reach my children. I caught up with them and then passed them because I knew which way we needed to go. I turned around to see if they were still following us and yes, they were behind us.

"Just as we were getting to the top of the hill a grenade exploded in the middle of us. We all fell on our faces and when I turned around I could tell my 6 year old boy, Luis Alonso was dead. The crown of his head had been cut right off and it was laying there a few feet from his body. It was a clean cut because you could see the bone of his skull. My 12 year old son Misael had been hit in the ear and I tried to help him up but he couldn't hold out his arms. He had a shrapnel wound in his back and it looked like the shrapnel had severed his [spinal] column. He told us to pray and then he told me to return and get some help. I left them together and was taken to the hospital. We weren't allowed to return for six days. When we returned six days later both of them were dead but the older boy must have lived several days because his body was fresh compared to Alonso's body."

In the first interview Guadalupe Castellanos said the Sandinistas had prohibited the people in her hometown from returning to the area where the grenade exploded. In her second interview she only mentioned that they did not locate the bodies until the sixth day but another independent witness testified that the Sandinistas had not permitted them to return and look for the bodies. The 12 year old, Misael was still alive when she left them. Guadalupe received two shrapnel wounds—one in her back and the other in her right elbow.

In responding to questions about how she knew it was the Sandinistas and not the Contras or a land mine she stated:

"It was a grenade because all the other people that were cutting coffee had passed through that same path and nothing had happened to them. You see, this isn't something invented or made up but is a reality because if my companions had passed by there and nothing happened to them, how was something going to happen to me. They had gone ahead of me and I was the last one to go up the path so there had been nothing in the path. The Sandinistas were the ones following us and the Contras weren't anywhere around so it would have to have been them."

Guadalupe's story was supported by almost undeniable evidence. Wes interviewed her on March 9 at about 11 a.m. That same day Wes interviewed a different group of 20 Nicaraguans in a different refugee camp that had arrived from the border only two hours before. Within this group was a 60 year old lady named Juana Maldonado de Castellano. When she mentioned she was from Dipilto Wes asked her if she remembered about anything that happened in her town two Christmases ago. She then responded:

"You must be talking about Guadalupe Costellanos. Her two sons were killed that Christmas when the Sandinistas threw a hand grenade at them. We [the people] weren't allowed to go look for the bodies out by the coffee fields for six days because the Sandinistas prohibited it. A piece of shrapnel had severed the young boy's [spine] column and he died hugging his younger brother because that is the way we found them, except the younger boy was decomposed."

Persecution of political opposition

Repression of Civic opposition groups has been extensive within Nicaragua since the revolution. Political dissension, especially among the youth, is not tolerated by the Sandinistas. Aside from the majority of those youth interviewed who fled to avoid the military draft, there were many who belonged to civil opposition groups inside Nicaragua. These Nicaraguan youth testify they were persecuted for their political divergence from the Sandinista revolutionary process.

While in Nicaragua Wes interviewed Manuel Urbina Lara's brothers. Manuel Urbina was the Nicaraguan youth who had exiled himself in the Costa Rican Embassy in Managua. On December 24 1985 he was forcefully taken out of the Embassy by Sandinista State Security. There are conflicting reports as to what actually happened at the Embassy compound on December 24.

Wes had an interview with the Costa Rican Ambassador a week after the incident. The Ambassador emphatically stated that Urbina must have been forced to leave the Embassy. Manuel Urbina's two brothers—one is named Luis Corronado Urbina Lara—were interviewed in the first week in December. Their version of Manuel's exile in the Costa Rican Embassy is different from the Sandinistas:

"Manuel was a law student at the Central American University in Managua. There he belonged to the political branch of ARDE. In October 1983 he and 50 other students were accused of counterrevolutionary activities and imprisoned. While in State Security custody they were placed in cells of 1 cubic meter and were forced to stand in cold water up to their ankles and were left there for several days. During this time the State Security forced them into collaborating with them. They were to return to their activities within the political branch of ARDE and find ways of discrediting the organization. After 12 days they were sent to the "Zona Franca" because of protests the government received from the CPDH. They were released on December 22, 1983 in pardon given by the Sandinista government. Six months later Manuel Urbine sought asylum in the Costa Rican Embassy."

On May 2, 1964, Cesar Augusto Miranda Ortega, member of the Social Democratic Party (PSC) in Nicaragua was forcefully taken out of his classroom by members of the Sandinista Youth 19 de Julio. They shaved his head, whipped him with belts and covered his body with oil paint putting it into his nose and ears. They did this while Sandinista police stood by watching. He was then taken to the Sandinista Police Sub-Station and interrogated by State Security. Six hours later he was transferred to the Hospital Manolo Morales.

They took him out of the classroom because, as a member of the political opposition, he voiced his opinions about the Sandinista ideology. His accusation appeared in the CPDH. While in Managua, Wes interviewed several ex-students who witnessed the event. One of the female students said many people quit studying at the University after Cesar Miranda was beaten. They said they feared for their lives and couldn't study under such conditions.

A similar incident occurred in the town of Matayalpa in April 1983. Esteban Martinez witnessed "divine mobs" attack a student named Cesar Flores. The following is his story:

"Cesar Flores belonged to an organization which opposed Sandinism called the Social Christians. One day the mobs, the Sandinista Youth, came to class and took him out and humiliated him. They cut his hair and made him swim in the open sewer there by the school. I saw this happen in April of 1983."

Demonstration in Chinandega

There was a demonstration in Chinandega one week before Arture Cruz visited there during his political campaign for the Presidency in November 1984. Several civic and political youth organizations were protesting against the forced military recruitment. The "turbas" attempted to break up the demonstration but were outnumbered by the students involved in the protest. Fabian Gustavo Betancour was the Secretary General for the Social Democratic Party in Leon and Chinandega and was involved in organizing the demonstration. He is now a refugee in Honduras. He describes the following incident:

"I am here [in Choluteca Honduras] and fled political persecution because I am a member of the Social Democratic Party. We had a protest one week before Arturo Cruz arrived. In this demonstration there were anywhere from one to two thousand students. The Mercantil college had asked me to organize a protest against military conscription. The Sandinistas arrived at this school and carried a list of all those who would serve in the military. We organized a peaceful demonstration because we didn't want to serve. We didn't want to kill our brothers and we wanted all this to end. We started the protest and took to the streets. Since the "divine mobs" couldn't attack us because there were only a few, they called in to Leon and Managua. Close to 1000 turbas arrived in IFA troop transports. Nearly all the schools were there with us. The streets were full of students, fathers. The turbas arrived and started hitting us with clubs. The police not only didn't stop them but joined in to help them attack us. As I told you before, this was a peaceful demonstration against the military service. During the demonstration a girl had her throat slit. Many people saw that a CDS woman who works in the market had done it. The Sandinistas said she had been asphyxiated, but how could she be asphyxiated with all the blood all over. There were journalists from La Prensa but they censored the paper so we couldn't read about it."

Four students from Chinandega substantiated Fabian's story about the murder of the girl. Two of the students were interviewed in the Jacaleapa refugee camp and the others were interviewed in Teupesenti.

FORCED VOLUNTEERISM

Eduardo and Maritza Pereira left Nicaragua May 19, 1984. They lived in an aldea

called "Las Playas" In Nuevo Segovia. Olivia's family wouldn't sell their grain to the government cooperative store in the area in which they lived. This incident occured on June 26, 1983:

"Olivia's father, Alejandro, would not accept the low price which the government offered him for his grains. When he refused to sell them the grain at that price they said they would force him to. The next day the Sandinistas arrived at Olivia's home and forced their way into the home. Alejandro and Olivia's two brothers were taken out to the back of the house. One brother managed to escape through the corn field. The father and son were put against the House and shot. Those who witnessed the shooting were Olivia's mother, a neighbor girl about 25 years old and Olivia's brother that had escaped. She said they had come to the house to teach her father to cooperate and not ever sell his grain to anyone but them."

Rodriguez Sanchez from Murra, Nueva Segovia is another peasant farmer who felt pressured by the Sandinista Cooperative system:

"The Sandinista regime made life impossible. Before there was a free commerce. Now if you sell your grain without permission they'll throw you in jail. Many of my friends were jailed for doing that. I left Nicaragua because I realized that the Sandinista regime didn't support the working campesino."

The students coming across the border told us that they are pressured, through the educational system, to work on the cooperatives. A common feeling among these youth was, "If you don't cut coffee and cotton then you are not advanced into the next grade."

CONCLUSION

As stated in the introduction, we have tried to follow the guidelines of objective research. Except for certain political and civic leaders in Nicaragua, we randomly selected all other sources from which we wrote this report. The testimonies were checked against other stories to verify their accuracy. Many testimonies were discarded in this process. The testimonies used in this documentary represent common themes encountered during the investigations. This report is based on personal testimonies given to us. We used only a few examples to illustrate the abuses we heard during our interviews. We have many more which would further substantiate our findings.

From the 100's of interviews conducted we conclude that the Sandinista regime has systematically repressed those Nicaraguans who are not in support of their government.

The Sandinista government has lost popularity among the Nicaraguan people and has attempted to retain it's stronghold in Nicaragua through the use of force and terror.

Those groups most affected by the Sandinista's systematic use of force and repression are:

Religious groups, especially evangelic and pentecostal movements;

Peasants not willing to farm cooperatives or sell food in the government;

Teenage youth from 15 years and older not willing to serve in the military.

Civic and political organizations which don't support the policies of the government; and

Nicaraguans not actively involved in promoting the growth of the Sandinista system.

There is an underlying fear among all the Nicaraguans interviewed which should be mentioned in order to explain the diversity of stories currently coming out of Nicaragua. The people feel betrayed by their government and by the international community as a whole. They are very cautious about speaking out against a government they feel has control of the international humanitarian groups as well as the international journalists.

Many refugees said it was too dangerous to tell visitors about their experiences while they were still in Nicaragua. Others mentioned how they told reporters and Sandinista officials that their sons and daughters had been kidnapped by the Contras when in reality they had fled the country voluntarity or had joined the Contras themselves. To lie was the only way for them to avoid reprisals. We believe the type of systematic repression instituted by the Sandinistas has been successful in keeping much of this information from leaving Nicaragua.

We ask human rights organizations and journalists to talk to refugees in Honduras and Costa Rica. If they do this, a new side of the conflict in Nicaragua will become even more apparent. If groups choose to continue to ignore the causes of the steady stream of refugees and the stories they bring, reporters and human rights activists will not be doing justice to truth, nor to the common people of Nicaragua.

□ 1850

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to underscore something that the gentleman just said moments ago about a Nicaraguan citizen who was murdered under the Sandinista government. He was taken out into the mountains or elsewhere and left to be found and then was attributed, his death, to Contra activity.

I would like to augment that with information that I received upon a visit to El Salvador in meeting with the Human Rights Commission and others, who explained to us how that whenever there is support for the prodemocratic forces, that the left guerrillas can, at will, murder anyone, indiscriminately; throw them on the steps of the local news bureau or any of the international news organizations; point to that as activity by the death squad, that then gets full coverage across the globe as death squad activity. It leaves the prodemocratic, profreedom forces in the position of having to justify why this activity went on.

That has been so successful in El Salvador and has been brought to a successful art in Nicaragua where now they have formed Contra forces in the Sandinista Army. The Sandinista Army dresses up as though they are freedom fighters; they enter a village; declare themselves as prodemocratic, profreedom Contras; of course, they are warmly received by the citizens of the Nicaraguan village. Once they have identified who the potential supporters of the Contra forces would be, they then herd them into the center of town; murder them, and then leave.

Of course, an international news bureau that were to reenter that village; were to pose the question to the wives or mothers or surviving children of the murdered citizens of Nicaragua, would then report that the Contras came into our village, they murdered the men, the women and the children, and they left. That has been a very successful tactic, and I can say that over this following weekend, those forces that are antidemocratic, pro-Communist, pro-Sandinista will attempt to use that Communist tactic in every conceivable fashion over these next 72 hours. They will attempt to broadcast it on television and on radio.

I appreciate the gentleman for bringing that particular tactic to our attention.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman raising that fact. As a matter of fact, I might say that I just spoke with a citizen of Nicaragua not more than 2 days ago and he detailed the same account to me. In fact, he named the individual in charge of that Sandinista squad. Unfortunately, I cannot remember his last name, but his first name was Irene, I-r-e-n-e. I will get his last name for the RECORD so that we can supplement the RECORD for posterity.

I appreciate the gentleman pointing that out. I might also say that these incidents have been documented on a regular basis. There is adequate testimony if only people want to sit down and listen to it. There are plenty of people in Nicaragua who will talk about this stuff.

□ 1900

Madam Speaker, I have just come back from Managua. I have spoken to lots and lots of people on my own, and I can tell you that all of the stories I have heard from the people who do not favor the Sandinista regime back up, confirm, corroborate exactly what is in this report by these two Morman missionaries, Wesley Smith and Richard Rygg.

I might also add that there seems to be a trend of, well, a whole stream of American citizens and internationals, Canadians, and other people from Western Europe who are taking advantage of the opportunity afforded them by the Nicaraguan government, the Sandinista government, the Stalinista government, to get cheap airline fares to fly to Nicaragua to watch a dog-and-pony show put on by the Nicaraguan government and come back and blast the United States and blast anybody who would try to help the Contra movement.

But the fact is that is a trumped-up charge and those people are either being suckers or overtly allowing themselves to be used by the Sandinista government, because if anybody is truly interested in the plight of the

Nicaraguan people, they need only read this objective report by these two young missionaries who went down with no bias whatsoever and came back with this amazing account of one atrocity after another, perpetrated by the Sandinista, the Stalinista government, against the people of Nicaragua.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 239, TO APPROVE THE OBLIGATION OF FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR SUPPORTING MILITARY OR PARAMILITARY OPERATIONS IN NICARAGUA

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 136) providing for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 239) to approve the obligation of funds available under Public Law 98-473 for supporting military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2068, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, AND THE BOARD OF INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING AUTHORIZATIONS, 1986 AND 1987

Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-51) on the resolution (H. Res. 137) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2068) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

INTERVIEW WITH ARCHBISHOP OF MANAGUA

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, as I said this morning in opening remarks during a 1-minute speech, we are entering a very tense period in the history of the Congress of the United States. We are going to begin that tense period, it appears, with a statement on whether or not Mr. Rick McIntyre, from the Eighth District of Indiana, who was twice certified as the winner of his congressional election last November 6, is going to be seated amongst us here in this body.

I am afraid the way events seem to be coming down in that story that a lot of good will is going to be lost in this House and there will be much hard feeling. The timing could not have been worse, and I was afraid this was going to happen: That it would come in conjunction with the beginning of the debate toward a vote on whether or not to support President Ronald Reagan's policies in Central America and the Caribbean.

Because of the late hour tonight, and our staff of recorders and clerks here, as usual working so hard and being so patient, and all of our brilliant staff members in the two cloakrooms, I am going to defer much of what I wanted to say tonight about the Nicaraguan problem to Monday night, but I would like to insert in the RECORD for my colleagues to read, and hopefully a handful will read, because I have this horrible feeling that we are talking past one another on this issue, and that nobody will listen to the thoughtful comment on the opposing side that each of us take on this issue of aid to the Nicaraguan democratic resistance forces, as I choose to call them.

I am trying not to do that. I am trying to listen to the documentation of the atrocities on the other side and seek out truth, because very rarely is anything in life black and white, there are always shades of gray; however, I have this feeling that those in the leadership on the majority side of the House of Representatives have closed their minds completely to the fact that there may be as many atrocities on the side of the Communist government in Managua as there were earlier when the Contras were first out in the field and they had not developed the discipline of a military structure, as I believe they have now.

I also, like the gentleman from Louisiana who just spoke, Mr. LIVINGSTON, have just returned in the last couple of weeks from three countries in Central America. It was my eighth trip in just 4 years to that region, and I had probably one of the most fascinating interviews in Managua with the archbishop of that archdiocese, Archbishop Miguel Obando y Bravo.

I said when I returned on April 3 in this Chamber that I have never met a more courageous man in this Hemisphere, and I mean that. Here is a man who truly accepts the full responsibility of being the shepherd of his flock there and he has been the president alternately of all the nine bishops in Nicaragua, and the things he told me in a long interview that I sat in on with Congressman VIN WEBER of Minnesota sharing the questioning with me, fortunately was tape recorded and has been carefully transcribed so that we could bring back for the first time, I believe, to this chamber in depth the remarks of the archbishop, the only archbishop of the nine in Nicaragua.

The interview was conducted, the dialog on March 30, 1985, and I would like to submit that for the RECORD:

INTERVIEW WITH ARCHBISHOP OBANDO Y BRAVO, MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, MARCH, 30, 1985

SERRA, HUNDLEY & FLORES,
St Paul, MN, April 15, 1985.

Mr. FRANK GRAVES,
476 Woodlawn,
St. Paul, MN.

DEAR MR. GRAVES: Thank you very much for considering us to do the translation of the tape taken from the interview with the Archbishop Obando y Bravo of Nicaragua.

Present at the interview were Congressman Vin Weber, R-Minnesota, Congressman Robert Dornan, R-California and Frank Graves National committeeman of the Independent Republican Party of Minnesota. Also present were Jack Meeks, Chief of Staff to Vin Weber in Minnesota, Brian Barnett, Administrative Assistant to Bob Dornan, Lynn Bouchey, Director of the Council of Inter American Security, and the interpreter. Because of difficulties in distinguishing the individuals asking questions, we have not identified them individually in the transcript. Most questions were asked by Robert Dornan, Vin Weber, and Frank Graves.

This interview took place on March 30, at the residence of Archbishop Obando y Bravo. It began at 1:30 p.m. and lasted for more than 90 minutes. The translation as represented in the attached transcript is as accurate as we could make it. However, there are problems with the audio tape, in that at times too many people are speaking at once and quite a few times the instantaneous translation superimposes the English over the Spanish. Occasionally neither are intelligible. In such cases, where translation is not possible, we have attempted to construct "the sense of the conversation" based upon contextual continuity. Such passages are indicated by underlining the section in question. In most cases we have translated directly from the Spanish. Whenever the original Spanish has been unintelligible, we have used the English version of the interpreter.

We have, in some cases, rearranged the punctuation and the structure of some of the paragraphs to make them more intelligible for the English reader. In no instances have the meaning of the statements been changed.

Thank you again for using the services of Serra, Hundley & Flores.

Sincerely,

ENRIQUE SERRA,
President.

BRAVO: No doubt that groups from the United States come here, and some of these groups are already prejudiced and have contacts with the Antonio Valdivieso Center, which is an ecumenical center in the sense that they represent both Catholic and Protestant groups, but they support the government. This is the institute of the Popular Church. At the bare grass roots level this Popular Church does not have any force, but it does at the propaganda level and it has many dollars and for the most part these groups from the United States come to this Center. The Center distorts a little bit the information and they go back to the United States saying that this is a marvelous system. Some come to find the truth, but the groups who come already

prejudiced rarely change their way of thinking.

INTERVIEWER: Do you think that they already come with a closed mind?

B: Some groups have already taken a position. When they speak to us they take a defensive attitude supporting the Sandinista government. We have also brought some Bishops from the United States, so they will know the realities and we have facilitated their meetings with different groups. We have been visited recently by the Archbishop of New York, O'Connor, the Archbishop of Washington, Hickey, Bishop John O'Mally and the Bishop of Corpus Christi. We have helped them to meet with people who have different ways of thinking. I have recognized that the Sandinistas have carried out a great amount of propaganda, not only in Nicaragua, but also in Europe. I have been to Germany and Italy. I think they have many sounding boards. International communism has given them a great deal of support.

I: Did not Archbishop Roach visit Nicaragua?

B: He was here for three days last year.

I: He has always been supportive of the Sandinistas and critical of President Reagan, but when he returned from his visit with you, he said that there was no choice but for the American Bishops to support the Bishops of Nicaragua. This was perceived by most people as a change in his position and that statement was very helpful to guide people from my part of the country. As an example of the kind of help that you can provide to us in your conversation with American Bishops, we need them to make those kind of statements they have not made before.

B: Some American Bishops have priests who advise them a little bit inclined toward the left and I think that these priests play an important role and they always come here with them. There are Maryknolls. Brian Heheir is always with them and they are inclined toward the left. Gallivan is another one.

I: Brian is the one who wrote the letter on capitalism and nuclear arms. He is the brains behind this group. He is machiavillian.

B: The Bishops in the United States say on the one hand that they are in agreement with the Bishops in Nicaragua, but on the other hand that they cannot justify Reagan's policy. I think that they are also under great pressure in the U.S. They told us to stop worrying, "Don't worry about what we say in the United States. We are under very strong pressure". On the other hand the Sandinistas send groups there and also the Maryknolls are very powerful.

I: Isn't that saying; don't mind us if we hurt you with what we say in the United States because we have pressures. We are supposed to lead.

I: We are elected. We are the ones who have to worry about the country. We are accountable only to the Holy Father and to God.

B: But there is no doubt they have pressure and Sandinistas visit all these Bishops and Archbishops and send the newspaper "Barricada" to them. And this is the kind of information that each Sandinista ambassador takes and not only to the Bishops of the United States, but also to other Bishops and Cardinals of South America.

I: Where is Father Pena?

B: He is in the Church of the Holy Spirit.

I: Is he in danger?

B: No, we have protected him, but to live here is always dangerous.

I: Have you gone to his church and said mass with him?

B: We have been in mass together. We are very good friends.

I: Have you had to telephone Daniel Ortega?

I: Well, when he was arrested we tried to establish a dialogue with Tomas Borge. He promised us that he would not do anything to him, but that very same day he sent a mob (turbas) that beat some of the people who were at the church. Then we limited ourselves to public statements and after a few months he was set free.

I: Was he beaten in prison?

B: He was under house arrest in the seminary. He was there for a few months.

I: Is your seminary allowed to operate here to train your people?

B: Yes, for the time being we are giving the philosophical orientation that we want. We have asked the government that they be excused from military service.

I: Have they threatened you?

B: Well we have to send them the list to see if they are going to excuse them from the military draft.

I: Is that still up in the air?

B: For the moment it has been resolved.

I: Let's come back to the Popular Church (Iglesia Popular). Do the priests of the Popular Church say they are not under your discipline as the shepherd of Nicaragua?

B: According to their public statements they are in communion with the Pope. But this is only of a tactical nature because in reality they follow a sectarian politics. They support the government in everything, even if it means going against the Pope himself.

I: Have they said this to you?

B: They have said it through the newspapers. For instance, when the Pope declared himself against the participation of priests in the council of ministers, these priests were against the orders of the Pope. They have very strongly criticized the Bishops publicly.

I: How many priests are in the Popular Church?

B: There are about ten Nicaraguans, but there are Canadians, Spaniards, and other foreigners.

I: How many Americans?

B: There are South Americans and North Americans. There are some nuns and priests who come from all over to organize seminars. They are sort of traveling in a laboratory.

I: Don't they come to you when they arrive? Don't they come for facilities?

B: That is arranged by the Popular Church. They organize seminars in the Valdivieso Center, the Historic Institute and they leave making statements to the effect that the only solution is Marxist-Leninism and struggling because Marxist-Leninism advocates class struggle.

I: We probably have some more technical questions but let me get a little philosophical now. Our Bishops that we love are in redemption, not in revolution; they don't go around recommending bombs or guerrilla movements, they don't talk about Jesus, so we have no Bishops on our side. Those who have to be secular, political and paid for (unintelligible) but the priests into revolution, defend killing, terrorism, bombs and they defend atheistic governments, Moscow or Cuba. How can we win? If our Bishops are silent and these priests slap the Bishops face, do what they want and ask me to pay for their clothes, their food, their houses, their gasoline and their car. I am very frustrated.

B: There is no doubt, I have been in meetings with American Bishops from C.E.L.A. and they demand that the U.S. disarm. I think that it is also necessary to disarm the Soviet Union, because if you only disarm one part it becomes very dangerous. There are groups of priests who think that Marxist-Leninism can be used to interpret social, political and economic realities, ignoring, so they claim, ideology. But it is impossible to define it this way, because they accept class ideology and they arrive at the conclusion that the end justifies the means.

I: Have some of these priests lost their vocation?

B: They deny it, but in practice they are orientated toward marxism, yes, they are marxist.

I: Do any of the "nine comandantes" go to church, go to communion or go to confession?

B: No, none of them.

I: Does Miguel de Scoto still go to church?

B: Well, it might be that he goes to church in the United States, but here in Nicaragua, I have never seen him in any church.

I: We were discussing before coming here, the status of the priests in the government; de Scoto, Cardenal etc. According to common law, what is their status within the church?

B: This problem was handled by the Vatican with the Bishop superior of these people, naturally the Holy See stated that priests must not occupy ministerial positions within the governments. During the first stage, the Holy See extorted the Bishops of Nicaragua to have a dialogue with these individuals and we concluded with them, that as long as they were members of the council of ministers, they would not be able to exercise their priestly duties neither publically nor privately. During the second stage, the Holy See asked them to resign from their posts but they refused. They are suspended, yet they continue on their jobs.

I: What's the difference between the first stage and the second one?

B: In the first stage, legally they could not be suspended (a divine). It was agreed with them that as long as they were members of the council of ministers, they could not exercise their priestly duties, whether public or private. In the second stage, they were told that if they did not leave their post, they would be. * * *

I: A decree from the Vatican.

B: From the Vatican or the Bishops, some of them are diocesan, like Ernesto Cardenal. His Bishop was instructed to send him a decree stating that if he didn't leave his position in fifteen days he would be suspended. He answered refusing to do so because he was going to be faithful to the revolution.

I: Fernando Cardenal is the minister of Education and Ernesto is * * *

B: Ernesto is minister of Culture and a diocesan priest. Fernando was a Jesuit priest and he was expelled by the Jesuits.

I: According to common law they are all forbidden to exercise their priesthood.

B: They would not be able to do it legally.

I: The next step; if they did something disloyal to the Pope, would be to defrock them.

B: An additional step would be for them to lose their priesthood in a legal sense. A priest may lose legally his status of priesthood through a very grave fault and when there is a rescript (official written order) from the Holy See. But this rescript can only be given by the Vatican and no Bishop can give it. Things are kind of tranquilizing,

but their status of priesthood can legally be taken away from them.

I: One more step could be excommunication.

B: The worst thing you can do is to take away their state of priesthood.

I: Has this been suggested to the Vatican?

B: The Vatican has remained silent about it.

I: But they are still thinking about the whole matter.

B: I thought that the Vatican was going to continue giving, but they just have been silent.

I: If Father Pena is ever beaten to death by the "turbas divinas", would the Pope move swiftly?

B: It depends on the information received by the Holy Father because, the first person in the church to defend a priest must be his bishop.

I: These people who come here with their prejudice; they are coming here to reinforce their prejudice. They come back to Minnesota to preach to the Lutheran congregation and their message is that there are now in Nicaragua two churches; the rich church and the people's church, and they say that the rich church, the traditional church, is out of touch with the people and has no following any more because everybody is going to the Popular Church. Then I hear from other people that this is a lie. So I would like to hear from you the Archbishop, what the truth is.

B: That is the kind of propaganda that the Frente Sandinista carries out in favor of the so called "Popular Church", but this is not the reality. If you are here tomorrow morning in Nicaragua, you can come to mass here at eleven o'clock and you will be able to see a good number of people. If you stay here until Holy Thursday you will see around ten thousand people. If you remain here until Good Friday, you will see around one hundred and twenty thousand, while the Popular Church will be able to assemble only a few people. But of course when they want to organize a show of public display, be it Catholic or not, they do it in a small church to give the impression that it is filled. I have been out in the country this week and I have seen many farmers (campesinos). Obviously, if you talk about the church of the poor, you are talking about us. We have visited the rural areas. This morning I visited with the sick of a church. We are the poor ones because we don't have any access to television. Our Catholic radio programs are censored by the government. But, there are certain priests that can make use of radio, television and government newspapers. They can say anything they want to while we suffer censorship. At the economic level we are the Church without land or property. We must live from what the leaders want to give us. There are some priests that receive not more than fifty dollars a month.

I: Does the Popular Church get money?

B: Yes, last year the Antonio Valdivieso Center received half a million dollars.

I: I would like to ask one more question. Geraldine Macias told me and a few other people, that to the unescapable detriment of the Sandinistas, that the people who now are reading the Bible, whether it is in the Popular Church or the other one, are not being deceived by marxist rhethoric. When they read the word of God they will sooner or later see the truth and her organization "The New Exodus" in Washington, most of the refugees who are coming from Nicaragua are people who have made a decision based on what they have read in the Bible. Is that what is happening?

B: I don't know if I am following your question.

I: The point is that she says that the word in the Bible overcomes propaganda.

B: There is no doubt that some of these priests from the Popular Church try to interpret the Bible from a marxist viewpoint. A good example of this is their interpretation of the passage of the good samaritan. Imperialism passed by, he saw him wounded and he closed his eyes. The Church passed by and also closed her eyes and did nothing until the Sandinistas Front came, cured him and housed him. Here they have not had too much success because the Bishops have exercised great leadership and they are believed by the people. That has stopped them a little bit, but probably with time the government may pressure the people and take advantage of that. Now they are having problems because the people believe the Bishops.

I: Evidently, their tactic of misinterpreting the Bible is backfiring. It's not working.

B: No doubt this has damaged them because we have been clear on this. You can not betray or distort God's words. We have spoken honestly, even though that we are aware that this could place us in danger of being attacked by the "turbas" (the mob).

I: Are all the Bishops of Nicaragua in total solidarity?

B: We are together. Each Bishop has a different temperament. Some are more independent, others are a little more generous toward the government. But when it comes to a pastoral letter, all of them sign it. Some Bishops are more combative, others are more passive.

I: Bishop Vega is like a rock.

B. He balances himself out.

I: Do you receive support from Rivera y Damas of El Salvador and the rest of the Bishops of Central America?

B: I am a good friend of Rivera y Damas, he was my law professor and we are from the same order, the Saleseans.

I: We met with him yesterday.

B: Yes, we are friends. He is going through a very different situaion, but we talked recently. We were in Costa Rica and we traveled together on the same plane. I tell him my experiences and he tells me his. We are friends but our situation is different.

I: Do you have a friendship with Bishop O'Connor?

B: Yes, I have been a guest of Bishop O'Connor twice in New York.

I: So you were meeting him for the first time?

B: No, I had already written him a letter inviting him to here.

I: Who was the boss of that committee, Bernardine or O'Connor?

B: O'Connor.

I: Was it obivous?

B: If he was not the boss, at least he made it look like he was.

I: Is Hickey more realistic about it?

B: I have been a guest of his, he asked me to stay at his house if I visit the U.S. I think that he understood the reality a little better. I think that he has always been influenced by some groups. He has been to Nicaragua twice.

I: He is a problem for us in the United States.

B: That's because he has pressure groups there and he greatly admires the Maryknoll nuns.

I: He feels responsible that Jean Donovan and one of his nuns were killed in El Salvador. They were from Cleveland. Did he tell you that?

B: No, he did not, but I know he has a picture of those nuns in his house.

I: Another problem is of course the bureaucracy of the U.S. Catholic Conference and that means Father Heheir, and that is bad news.

I: Archbishop, I am 51 years old, for 50 years, priests and nuns were my heroes. Last year, in coming back to Congress, eight nuns and priests told a lie. They took a full page ad in a newspaper, stating that abortion was not important, and Central America was everything. My political opponent has voted for abortion, so what, the House of Representatives, we have one hundred and twenty six Catholics. They are many. All the Catholics who vote for abortion, maybe two dozen of them, don't go to church any more, laugh at their Bishops on moral issues, but love the Bishops on Central America and disarmament and quote them on this every day. Those of us who practice our faith, go strong on moral issues such as abortion, narcotics and pornography, find ourselves opposite to our Bishops. One man; Brian Heheir is like Rasputin, he is behind everything and he is splitting us.

B: He is a very intelligent man.

I: Yes, Lenin was very intelligent.

I: Let me tell you what a sister said. Three nuns came here on a quick trip of two or three days; Sister Kromer Corandelay, Marianne Hepper and Sister Shinhoover, sister of St. Joseph. They said that there were no problems with the church in Nicaragua and the Popular Church was the real one and that the nine Bishops, then she paused, and said, "You know what Bishops are like; there is a misunderstanding with the hierarchy, our problem is our Bishops, and the church in Nicaragua is not oppressed." They denied when I said, quoting you, that Marxist Leninist literature is forced in parochial schools.

B: There is a materialistic orientation in the schools. The teachers must attend workshops and the workshops give them orientation. All schools have to attend these programs. Of course we try to introduce religion in one way or another, but the program is materialistic.

I: Can you give an example of how it is materialistic?

B: They disregard God and emphasize evolution. Likewise they also emphasize biology, economics and politics. They also insist on teaching about the martyrs and heroes of the revolution.

I: What about the members of the resistance, the contras? Are they friends of the Church where they are active or do they persecute the Church? What is your relationship with them?

B: I don't have any direct relationship with them at a personal level. They are in the mountains of Matagalpa, Jinoteca and the Atlantic coast. The reports sent to me by the Bishops who work there show that they have not received any problems from them, none.

I: Less problems than priests and Bishops have had from the government?

B: The reports that I have received from the priests of those areas, is that they have not had any problems with them.

I: Do any priests travel as chaplains with the contras? Enrique Bermudez in the north and Eden Pastora in the south have chaplains?

B: There are no priests, that I know of, working as chaplains.

I: What is your appraisal of the proposal made by Arturo Cruz to the Contadora regarding dialogue?

B: We Bishops put out a short while ago, a communique. In this communique we agreed that we could serve as mediators as long as the two sides in conflict want a dialogue and will accept us as mediators. We cannot impose the dialogue. The government has not given us an official response, but in government media, there has been an attack against the Bishops, accusing them of wanting dialogues with criminals and that they (the Sandinistas) will only dialogue with the master of the dog. The only thing they said is that they will only dialogue with the mouth of the machine gun.

I: That's pretty hard. I don't know if you can approve of aid to the contras resistance, but do you condemn them? If President Reagan asks for aid or we vote for aid, would you condemn that?

B: We have always been clear on this. We have stated that the ideal would be to find political solutions; that would be ideal. But of course, the layman can take their own attitudes and positions. The layman can choose his options without the need to consult with the hierarchy.

I: Can a campesino fight with the contras in good conscience and go to communion?

B: This depends on his conscience. I accept that in the moral field, and I quote from the words of Paul VI at Medellin (Colombia), violence is neither Christian nor Evangelical. But then he says that when there is an unjust situation and everything else has been tried, you can take up arms as a last resort, provided that the situation will get better and not get worse. The same it is said in number thirty eight of (unintelligible) when there is an institutionalized injustice and as a last resort, you can go as far as that. This is as long as you have used up every other means. The layman could make up his own reasoning if he believed that this is his last resort.

I: As long as you hold to the promises of improvement.

B: Not if they are going to get worse, but if they are going to get better, the answer is yes.

I: This is an important point, moral theology. This is an issue of moral truth.

B: This is based on Thomestic ethics; in the presence of an unjust agressor, I have the right to legitimate defense.

I: I have a different question. We can leave the Catholic area for a minute. As difficult as conditions have been for the Catholic Church here, we have heard even more horrible stories about the treatment of other religions in Nicaragua by the Sandinistas, particularly the Pentecostals, and to an extent the Jews. Can you comment for us on the treatment of the smaller religions, such as the Protestants, by the government. Are they oppressed?

B: Some Protestants are on the safe side. They had their problems. They took synagogues away from the Jews. The Protestants who have not been aligned with the government have been harassed. Most people here are Catholics. When there is a confrontation with the Catholic Church it has great publicity. Around here the Catholic Church is stronger.

I: In April of 1984 you had a pastoral letter that the Church was being oppressed. This is what I told Marianne Hepper the nun. Do stand by that letter, that you being oppressed then?

B: We the Bishops had established conversations December 24th of last year. At present there is a commission of Bishops that continue conversations with a commission of the government. We have had difficulties in obtaining visas for foreign priests who want to come here. Many of the missionaries who were here were getting tourist visas rather than resident visas, so we have started a dialogue to see if all these problems are solved. They have not been solved entirely. They are being partially solved. There is no doubt that there have been problems for us. People in our Church are being pressured by the CDS's block committees. Some catechists have been sent to jail. There have not been any more attacks by the "turbas" as the one in June of last year. As you know my car was twice destroyed by the "turbas". They broke the glass windows.

I: Were you in the car?

B: I was dressed in red very solemnly.

I: Were you both times in the car?

B: Not the first time. The second time I was inside. They threw rocks and they broke all my windows, but not my head (laughter).

I: That would have been a sacrilege. May I give you an opinion in closing?

B: O.K.

I: I believe monsignor, that things are a little better because young men in Nicaragua are fighting with the democratic resistence. And I am saying a rosary for them every day at work and every day at home and I go to communion every day.

B: And for the Bishop also (laughter).

I: I am going to vote for aid for the democratic resistance in good conscience.

B: That's good. Does the other congressman have a last word?

I: The Archbishop mentioned that he had been to Washington, perhaps he is coming again soon?

B: I have been invited to go to Washington the 15th of April, but I can't go. I haven't announced it. I am being invited by the State Department. I have to consult on this, as a matter of courtesy, with the Bishop there and my presence there always receives wide publicity.

I: It would be very helpful for us, whenever you can, to come to Washington and talk to the people and the news media as well as people in Congress. When you come to Washington we will be honored if you will allow us to arrange private meetings, off record, unpublicized, with members of Congress.

B: I will let you know when I go there. I think that Monsignor Carballo might be going there by the middle of April. I am abstaining from going because as Archbishop it will attract so much publicity and as a matter of courtesy I have to count on the Bishop there. All this creates a little bit of a problem for me.

I: He is the priest who was set up and ran on up the street naked (only in English).

I: With your permission.

I: He works for you.

B: We are very grateful for what you are doing for Nicaragua. Thank you for this pleasant visit.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Also, I want to put in the RECORD, having just come over to the Chamber from the conclusion of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member—I served 2 years in 1981 and 1982 on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee and passed up an opportunity to serve on it during the next 2 years and, of course, when heightened debate begins on this issue I am going to regret that decision, but I chose instead to serve on the Arms Control Subcommittee and the Subcommittee on the Middle East, Europe, and the Soviet Union, because I believe that time will bear me out that in the next 2 years those may be coequally if not more important than what is happening here in our own hemisphere.

But there is no getting around the fact that the doctrine outlined by President John F. Kennedy in the most amazing inaugural address I have ever heard by a President in my life, that address that was given by young John Kennedy on that biting, cold morning of January 20, 1961, he laid out what I will call during the debate next week the Kennedy doctrine, and it was very clear, very succinct, and it has rung like a powerful bell down through the decades as a guide to how we should approach an alliance of friendship and progress and brotherhood and sisterhood with these tiny little nations in the isthmus of Central America that is truly a part of the North American Continent.

□ 1910

You can feel that when you arrive at one of the airports down there in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua. We are truly closer to the United States in my State of California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, the Deep South, and certainly much closer to Miami, when we are down there than Miami itself is, or any Texas cities are to the Capital, Washington, DC.

At the subcommittee hearing, the hearing of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, this afternoon and into the evening, one person's testimony, I think, with all due respect to all the fine people who testified, stood out head and shoulders above all the rest. He is a distinguished educator in our country, a professor of great renown, president of the esteemed Boston University, and was a member of the Presidential Commission on Central America. In shorthand, that was referred to in the media as the "Kissinger Commission." I am speaking of Mr. John R. Silber.

Mr. Silber gave much testimony on the Kennedy doctrine, and I will be putting some of that in next week. But in the eight pages of his opening remarks that he delivered in totality with great feeling in front of the subcommittee, there was one paragraph I would like to read, and I hope, although I am going to try to make it a rule for myself, that Members on both sides of the aisle, particularly on the majority side, will realize that these words of Mr. Silber not only apply to the debate over aid to the resistance forces of the so-called Contras, but

they really should apply to any debate here. We very often, I think, forget them, and I think there is going to be a temptation to forget this friendly admonition or this friendly observation this time.

Professor Silber, President Silber, said this: "I am aware that many patriotic Americans, some of them distinguished members of this subcommittee, oppose aid to the Nicaraguan rebels and do so on highly principled grounds." And I am sure he would not mind my paraphrasing that to include the whole House and the other body.

I acknowledge that. I know that there are many Members who on principle have problems with covert action or overt action and have problems with a not duly recognized fighting force. However, please, all Members, recognize that there are those of us who want to support the partisans in the hills of Nicaragua, the resistance in Nicaragua, the democratic forces in Nicaragua, what we believe to be the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, and that we are also basing our support on highly principled grounds.

Where I feel a terrible frustration in this debate is that much of the testimony, such as the brilliant testimony brought forward by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] in the last hour, should have been discussed on this House floor all during November, up until the adjournment for the November 6 election, and that somehow or other Congressmen should have found ways to write op-ed news pieces in the newspapers of this country and call their local television stations and, yes, even call CBS, NBC, and ABC, the owned and operated stations, and Management Process in New York to ask them to make sure that both sides of this story be presented before the American people. That has just simply not happened. We are playing catchup.

I hope the rule that was just introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], on this debate on the foreign policy of our President toward Nicaragua will make provision for as much debate as is humanly possible to get all aspects of this story out before the American people.

Madam Speaker, I submit the opening eight pages of Mr. Silber's remarks before the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF JOHN R. SILBER, PRESIDENT, BOSTON UNIVERSITY, APRIL 18, 1985

In 1962 the United States met a major Soviet challenge in Cuba decisively and directly. Under President Kennedy's firm leadership, we forced the removal from Cuba not only of Soviet missiles that threatened the eastern half of the United States, but of aircraft, troops and all offensive military hardware. Regrettably, in the years that followed, distracted by Vietnam and Watergate, we allowed the Soviets to return offensive weapons to Cuba in carefully graduated increments. Cuba now provides them with bases for anti-submarine aircraft, a submarine base tending nuclear and conventional submarines, a massive intelligence installation which monitors communications within the United States, and airfields capable of receiving supersonic intercontinental bombers.

In short, Mr. Chairman, the island of Cuba has become a massive Soviet forward base from which revolution is exported to Central America. It is not my purpose to trace the steps by which this came to be but to ask whether the United States is prepared to tolerate in our hemisphere the consolidation of a second Soviet satellite.

In my opinion, our country is now confronted with problems less sensational but no less dangerous than those which President Kennedy faced and solved, however temporarily. (See Appendix A, *The Kennedy Doctrine.*)

All discussions of United States policy in Central America are bedeviled by historical myth. This is especially true of our policy toward Nicaragua. There are three controlling myths: the first is that the Sandinistas were incipient democrats whom an unkind United States drove into the arms of Cuba and the Soviet Union, and who would yet create a democratic Nicaragua if only approached diplomatically. No one who has read the pronouncements of the present Sandinista leadership before it took power could fall victim to this delusion. The Sandinistas described themselves as Marxist-Leninists long before 1979, and subsequent pronouncements by Sandinista leaders once in power only confirm this.

It is crucial to understand, moreover, that "Marxism-Leninism" is neither buzzword nor epithet but the name of a precisely defined political system whose nature has been revealed in nearly 70 years of unvarying practice. No Marxist-Leninist regime has ever submitted itself to the discipline of free elections, nor to the discipline of a free press, nor of free trade unions. Such regimes have permitted no genuine competitors for political power. Indeed such regimes have not even tolerated unauthorized private organizations.

This brief recapitulation of the obvious enables us to understand and predict the behavior of the Sandinista regime. It began, like most such regimes, with the seizure of power, first from the tyrants of the old order, and then from the democrats who had helped drive them out. It continued with the suppression of free speech and free media, curbs on free trade unions and private enterprise, and restrictions on the free exercise of religion. No Leninist regime has ever voluntarily moderated such behavior. The precedent, on the contrary, is for its intensification until the Sandinistas have throttled the last remains of free insititutions in Nicaragua. If the regime in Managua does not yet perfectly resemble that in Havana or Moscow, it is only because, for reasons to which I will return, it has not yet managed to consolidate its power.

All historical experience suggests that hopes of a merely diplomatic solution to the crisis posed by the Sandinistas are almost certain to be disappointed. The only solution likely to come from diplomacy unsupported by intensive pressure is the sort reached at Munich in 1938. Diplomacy is a complement to, not a substitute for, the measured application of geostrategic pressure.

The myth that the Sandinistas are misunderstood democrats, as well as others I will be discussing, did not just grow. They have been hyped through the latest marketing techniques by, among others, a Washington- and New York-based p.r. firm working on behalf of the Sandinista leadership. (See Appendix B, Fenton Communications, Inc. Newsletter.)

The second myth is that the military and political forces now opposing the Sandinistas are dominated by former associates of the Somoza regime who are fighting to restore the bad old days. This argument conveniently overlooks the major role played in the struggle against Somoza by many of the figures now fighting for democracy against the Sandinistas. One of these leaders, Eden Pastora, was a hero of the Sandinista forces before the revolution, described by Somoza himself in his memoires as "a communist terrorist." Others, such as Arturo Cruz and Violeta Chamorro, were members of the revolutionary junta before being forced out by the Sandinistas. Many others, including Alfonso Robelo, Adolfo Calero, and Alfredo Cesar, had actively opposed Somoza. The fact is that the so-called "contras" are the democratic leadership of the betrayed Nicaraguan revolution. When they call themselves "freedom fighters," they speak no more than the truth.

It is equally true that the Sandinistas are themselves employing the apparatchiks of the Somoza regime. Many former Somocistas now serve as leaders of the Committee for the Defense of the Revolution, a fact noted by Robert Leiken in his famous *New Republic* article repudiating his earlier support of the Sandinistas. (See Appendix C, *The Future of Democracy in the Hemisphere.*) This practice is in the tradition of Leninist regimes, which frequently make bureaucrats of the old despotism into useful servants of the new.

A third myth is that armed revolution led by the extreme left will bring democracy to Central America. The fact is that armed revolution has brought despotism, not democracy, to Nicaragua. In El Salvador, by contrast, Jose Napoleon Duarte's courageous democratic leadership, backed politically, militarily, and economically by the United States, has produced an increasingly broad-based and democratic government despite the pressures and chaos imposed by a Marxist-Leninist insurgency.

We must realize that El Salvador and Nicaragua pose instructive opposites: El Salvador is an imperfect democratic government. Its failures in human rights are most accurately described as its inability to embody its own principles, while it resists overthrow by totalitarians. Nicaragua is a totalitarian government. Its failures in human rights are most accurately described as the fulfillment of its own principles, while it resists overthrow by the forces of democracy. In El Salvador, we have a government whose inadequate guarantees of human rights demonstrate its present inability to live up to its ideals; in Nicaragua, the inadequacy is much more serious: it reveals the programs of a government fully living up to its ideals, under which the very concept of human rights independent of the state is meaningless.

Nothing is more reasonable, therefore, than that the United States should support both democracy in El Salvador by aiding a freely elected government against its armed enemies and democracy in Nicaragua by aiding the democratic opponents of a totalitarian regime.

I am aware that many patriotic Americans, some of them distinguished members

of this subcommittee, oppose aid to the Nicaraguan rebels and do so on highly principled grounds. I should like to pose, for these and other Americans, several questions. If we should not be aiding the Nicaraguan rebels now, at what point, if any, should we aid them? Those who would answer "never," whether they know it or not, are consigning the people of Nicaragua to an enduring Leninist despotism. If the Congress refuses to support those fighting for democracy in Nicaragua, the Sandinistas will conclude that they have succeeded in neutralizing the United States. We can then expect an immediate consolidation of the regime. Let us be clear what this consolidation will mean: the final surpression of free speech, free press, free trade unions, free religion, and the utter abolition of any vestige of pluralism in Nicaraguan society. It would certainly mean a vastly increased persection of the Miskito Indians.

To those who would answer "We will support democracy in Nicaragua eventually, but not now," I would ask, "When?" When the Sandinistas finally snuff out the flickering light of *La Prensa*? When they abolish the last free trade union? When they abolish all political parties but their own? I have said "when" rather than "if" because all these actions are inevitable.

There is another series of contingencies to which "if" applies. Would one favor support for the rebels if the Sandinistas acquire MIG fighters or more attack helicopters? If they step up their support of the rebels in El Salvador? If they begin exporting revolution to Honduras, to Guatemala, and to Costa Rica? If they invade any of these countries? At this point, of course, the question of aid to the freedom fighters will be moot, for they will long since have been crushed. The question will be whether one favors the survival of freedom and democracy in Central America, for by that time, the Cuban and Soviet forces will pose a serious and direct threat to Mexico and to the United States.

The price of containing Soviet adventurism in the Americas will never be as cheap, in dollars and blood, as it is today. Better by far to aid the so-called "contras" today than to send in the Marines later. Absent pressure of the type and intensity brought to bear by the democratic rebels, the Sandinista leadership will have no reason to negotiate a democratic outcome.

It is crucial in this to distinguish between El Salvador, where the overwhelming majority of those in authority are committed to democracy (and where, despite the doubts of many Americans, the vector seems solidly aimed at a democratic society) and Nicaragua, where those in power are committed to totalitarianism. We must not be misled by the noble ends professed by the Sandinistas. Like all Leninists, they ostensibly pursue splendid goals that can be summed up in two words: freedom and abundance. And like all Leninists, they will fasten upon the Nicaraguan people a system irrefragably opposed to freedom and irrefragably incapable of producing abundance.

The vote on aid to the "contras" is crucial. We stand where the British and French stood in 1936 when they faced Hitler's comparatively unconsolidated totalitarian regime. Unfortunately, they acted as if diplomacy and power were opposed concepts and allowed Hitler the first of his bloodless victories. The lessons of their folly should be entirely clear to all of us today: Totalitarians do not stop; they must be stopped.

The price Americans are now asked to pay for ending the Soviet-Cuban adventure in Nicaragua is very small. Each month it will rise. The United States, like Britain and France, will eventually pay the greatly escalated price that inaction will make inexorable. The Congress still has a chance to keep the price low by continued support of the Nicaraguan rebels.

In aiding the "contras," the United States has the opportunity to avoid the errors of the democracies in the late 1930s. Had the French, for example, sent no more than a division into Germany when Hitler remilitarized the Rhineland, he would have been forced into a humiliating withdrawal that would probably have precipitated his removal from power. Had Chamberlain not gone to Munich, a well-advanced plot by the German High Command to remove Hitler would have been put into effect and almost certainly succeeded. But the allies preferred to believe that Hitler would respond to diplomacy devoid of power and, acting on this illusion, they left no alternative to war. Their intentions were admirable: to avoid a repetition of the carnage of the First World War. But their admirable intentions did not prevent the carnage. The lesson lives on.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE LYNN MARTIN, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LYNN MARTIN, a Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 18, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Speaker, House of Representatives, H204 Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Ms. Allison Goddard of my district office has received a subpoena issued by the State of Illinois, County of Winnebago.

I will, in consultation with the General Counsel to the House, make the determination required by the Rule and will promptly notify you of those determinations.

Sincerely,

LYNN MARTIN,
Member of Congress.

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL FOR THE 99TH CONGRESS

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for the 99th Congress, adopted at the committee's organizational meeting on April 3, 1985:

RULES OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(Adopted April 3, 1985, 99th Congress, 1st Session)

RULE 1: GENERAL

The Rules of the House of Representatives, to the extent they apply, together with the following rules, shall be the rules of the Committee.

RULE 2. MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee for the conduct of its business shall be on the second Thursday of each month while the Congress is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) Special meetings may be convened as provided for by clause 2(c)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(d) At least 3 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) before each scheduled Committee meeting, each member of the Committee shall be furnished a list of the subjects to be considered or acted upon at such meeting.

RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) Members of the Committee shall be advised and a public announcement shall be made of the time, date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the Committee at least one week before the commencement of such hearing, unless the Chairman determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which event the Chairman shall advise Committee members and make the public announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this paragraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

(b) Unless authorized by the Chairman, a witness shall not be permitted to testify or present evidence at a hearing of the Committee, and such testimony or evidence may not be included in the Committee hearing record, unless 50 copies thereof have been delivered to the Committee at least 48 hours prior to such hearing.

(c) A Committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the Chairman for such purposes. In accordance with clause 2(j)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, each Committee member shall be allowed 5 minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. The Chairman shall, insofar as practicable, recognize alternately on the basis of seniority those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others on the basis of their arrival at the hearing. Thereafter, additional time may be extended at the discretion of the Chairman.

(d) At any hearing the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the subject matter of such hearing during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(e)(1) The Chairman at an investigative hearing of the Committee shall announce in the opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the Rules of the Committee and clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at an investigative hearing may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional

ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearing; and the Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(f) Any witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

RULE 4. COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

(a)(1) Unless otherwise required or permitted by these rules, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of Committee business. Any Committee member present at a Committee meeting may make a point of order that a quorum is not present, but a quorum shall be deemed present unless a member who is present objects.

(2) Two members shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(b) Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the Committee shall be open to the public or closed, in accordance with clauses 2(g)(1), 2(g)(2), or 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public session unless authorized by a majority of members voting, a majority being present.

(c) A vote by any member of the Committee with respect to any matter being considered by the Committee may be cast by proxy if the proxy authorization is in writing, asserts that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the Committee, designates the member of the Committee who is to execute the proxy authorization, and is limited to a specific matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto (except that a member may authorize a general proxy for motions to recess or adjourn, or for other procedural matters). Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. No proxy may be counted for the purpose of constituting a quorum.

(d) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon the demand of any member, and a copy made available to each member present.

(e) In the absence of the Chairman at any meeting or hearing of the Committee, the ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at such meeting or hearing.

(f) A complete record of all Committee action, including a record of all votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded, shall be maintained by the Committee. The result of each such rollcall votes shall be available to the public for inspection at the offices of the Committee during normal working hours.

(g) Any member of the Committee may demand and the Chairman shall order a rollcall vote on any matter considered by the Committee.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (b), any Committee report shall be approved by a majority of the members voting at a meeting at which a majority is present.

(2) A proposed report shall not be considered in a Committee meeting unless a copy of the proposed report is provided to each member of the Committee at least 5 days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) prior to the meeting.

(b) The Chairman is empowered to obtain the approval of any report in any appropriate manner, including by polling the members of the Committee in writing. In such cases, a copy of the proposed report shall be made available to each Committee member for at least 5 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) and the approval of a majority of the Committee is required. The Chairman shall promptly notify Committee members in writing of the approval or disapproval of the proposed report.

(c) Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed in accordance with clause 2(l)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House. The time allowed for filing such views shall be 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) after approval of a proposed report in a meeting of the Committee or after the Chairman issues a notification of approval pursuant to paragraph (b).

(d) If hearings have been held on the subject matter of the proposed report, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the Committee before seeking approval of the proposed report.

RULE 6. POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties, the Committee is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned.

(b)(1) The Committee may require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, documents, and other exhibits and materials, as it deems necessary.

(2) A subpena may be authorized and issued by the Committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(3) Notwithstanding subparagraph (b)(2) of this rule, a subpena may be authorized and issued in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities by the Chairman upon the concurrence of the ranking minority member on the Committee.

(4) Authorized subpenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

(c) The Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated from time to time by him, shall report on the meetings, hearings or other activities of the Committee to any other committee of the House which has subject matter jurisdiction therein.

RULE 7. BROADCASTING

(a) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee may permit such hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, under the rules established by paragraph (b) of this rule: Provided, however, that the Chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room.

(b)(1) If television or radio coverage of any hearing or meeting of the Committee is to be presented to the public as live coverage, such coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpena by the Committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or meeting or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of such hearing or meeting, by radio, or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted by the Chairman 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 such witness and such members to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from the hearing or meeting room while the Committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photograhers permitted by the Chairman to cover a hearing or meeting, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman, for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting between the witness table and the members of the Committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 8. AMENDMENT OF RULES

The Rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed, by a majority of the members voting at a meeting at which a majority is present. Written notice of any proposed change shall be provided to each member of the Committee not less than 3 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting date on which such change is to be considered.●

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of official business.

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. FRANK, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCMILLAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. RIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WEISS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CROCKETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PENNY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 60 minutes, April 25.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIVINGSTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, April 22.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, April 23.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, April 24.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCMILLAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKERNAN.
Mr. PARRIS.
Mr. SILJANDER.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. DAUB.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. FIELDS in two instances.
Mr. DREIER of California.
Mr. COURTER.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. KOLBE.
Mr. STUMP.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in three instances.
Mr. SKEEN.
Mr. SHUMWAY in two instances.
Mr. COATS.
Mr. MOORE.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.
Mr. GROTBERG.
Mr. CAMPBELL.
Mr. MOLINARI.
Mr. SAXTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MANTON.
Mr. LOWRY of Washington.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.
Mr. KASTENMEIER.
Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.
Mr. YATRON in three instances.
Mr. BARNES in six instances.
Mr. GAYDOS in two instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.
Mr. DOWNEY of New York.
Mr. RANGEL in four instances.
Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.
Mrs. LLOYD.
Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.
Mr. UDALL.
Mr. BOLAND.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. CROCKETT in five instances.
Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.
Mr. SWIFT.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. KOSTMAYER.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution commemorating the 24th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion to liberate Cuba from Communist tyranny.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to designate the week of April 14, 1985, as "Crime Victims Week."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On April 4:

H.R. 730. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Cocopah Indian Tribe of Arizona certain land in Yuma County, AZ;

H.R. 1239. An act making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1847. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. Sentencing Commission;

H.R. 1866. An act to phase out the Federal supplemental compensation program;

H.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to designate the week of September 8, 1985, as "National Independent Retail Grocer Week"; and

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution designating April 2, 1985, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

On April 18:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution commemorating the 24th anniversary of the Bay of Pigs invasion to liberate Cuba from Communist tyranny.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 22, 1985, at 3 o'clock p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1058. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the President's revised estimates of the 1986 budget, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1106(b) (H. Doc. No. 99-57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1059. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Shipbuilding and Logistics), transmitting notice of the Navy's plans to study the conversion of various functions at different installations from in-house operation to private contractor performance, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 nt. (Public Law 96-342, section 502(a) (96 Stat. 747)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1060. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a

draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and related statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1061. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs; transmitting a report of political contributions by Douglas W. McMinn, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs-elect, and members of his family, pursuant to Public Law 96-465, section 304(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1062. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of reports issued by the General Accounting Office in March 1985, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1063. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a report of the Authority's activities under the Government in the Sunshine Act covering calendar year 1984, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1064. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to include the Offices of Inspector General of the Department of Energy and the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on the Federal response to the homeless crisis (Rept. No. 99-47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on OPM's questioning of nonpartisan State voter registration activities constitutes a misuse of the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (Rept. No. 99-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Report on GSA's multiple award schedules (Rept. No. 99-49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 136. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 239, joint resolution to approve the obligation of funds available under Public Law 98-473 for supporting military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua (Rept. No. 99-50). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 137. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2068, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Board of International Broadcasting, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 99-51). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2106. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide loans to very low income families to permit such families to purchase single-family dwellings owned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 2107. A bill to provide agricultural credit and rural development assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. MADIGAN, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 2108. A bill entitled: the "Soil Conservation Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 2109. A bill to direct the President to liquidate assets of Vietnam or a national thereof in order to pay certain awards made by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 2110. A bill to make technical corrections related to the Retirement Equity Act of 1984; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BURTON of California:

H.R. 2111. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the access to higher education of low-income parents in need of child care services and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAUB:

H.R. 2112. A bill to retake and expand export markets for agricultural commodities, extend and revise price and income protection programs for farmers, provide for resource conservation, reform certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to agriculture, ensure consumers an abundant supply of food and fiber at reasonable prices, realign authority within the Department of Agriculture and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Ways and Means, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 2113. A bill to reform the laws relating to former Presidents; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, House Administration, the Judiciary, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. FIEDLER:

H.R. 2114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refundable tax credit for taxpayers who maintain households which include elderly persons who are determined by a physician to be disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FIEDLER (for herself, Mr. BATES, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WILSON):

H.R. 2115. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for congressional initiation of actions to respond to unfair foreign trade practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 2116. A bill to amend title XX of the Social Security Act to require, as a condition of Federal assistance to any State for the provision of child care services thereunder, that such State establish, monitor, and enforce appropriate child care standards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2117. A bill entitled: "The Attempted Kidnapping Act of 1985"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H.R. 2118. A bill amending chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a toll-free telephone service from which emergency assistance information may be obtained in case of an accident involving the transport of hazardous materials by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOWERY of California (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. COATS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HENDON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DENNY SMITH):

H.R. 2119. A bill to designate the portion of 15th Street SW., Washington, DC, located between Maine and Independence Avenues as "Raoul Wallenberg Avenue"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LUNDINE:

H.R. 2120. A bill to impose, during a 2-year period, surcharges on products imported into the United States if certain deficit reduction goals are met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 2121. A bill to provide for the reauthorization of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 2122. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal provisions relating to setting the interest rate on guaranteed or insured housing loans to veterans and inspecting manufactured homes purchased by veterans, to increase the VA loan fee, to authorize direct appropriations to the loan guaranty revolving fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2123. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Veterans' Administration to conduct certain health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BONKER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr.

FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. ZSCHAU):

H.R. 2124. A bill to prohibit the production of lethal chemical weapons, to encourage the negotiation of an international agreement to stop the production, proliferation, and stockpiling of lethal chemical weapons, and to encourage the improvement of defenses against the effects of the use of lethal chemical weapons on the Armed Forces; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 2125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that proceeds from identical wagers shall not be aggregated for purposes of determining whether tax should be withheld on such proceeds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for wagering losses shall be allowable as a deduction from gross income but only with respect to wagering transactions which are legal under Federal and State laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 2127. A bill to establish a U.S. Boxing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. BOULTER):

H.R. 2128. A bill entitled: the "Wheat Marketing Loan Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 2129. A bill to improve State criminal justice information systems, including criminal history records; to establish an interstate identification index based on criminal records and to provide assistance to States to use such index; to ensure that criminal history records are accurate and complete; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2130. A bill to amend the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 to provide for assistance to certain individuals who are injured or die while preventing crime or apprehending criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify that volunteer trustees, directors, and officers of public charities shall not be penalized under the tax laws as a result of such public services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 2132. A bill to amend Public Law 96-350 to further define the customs waters for the purposes of certain drug offenses; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUMWAY:

H.R. 2133. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. COELHO):

H.R. 2134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to limit the amount of farming losses which may offset other income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2135. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide mortgage assistance to veterans with loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration in order to avoid foreclosure of such loans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 2136. A bill to provide for additional protection of steelhead trout as a game fish, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 2137. A bill to strengthen human nutrition research conducted by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. REID):

H.R. 2138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to simplify certain requirements regarding withholding and reporting at the source and to correct inequities regarding carryover of losses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that net legal wagering gains shall not be included in gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 2140. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to cause the exportation, at competitive world prices, of basic agricultural commodities produced in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTAKER:

H.R. 2141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to improve public access to Pearson-Skubitz Big Hill Lake, KS; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 2142. A bill to authorize the project for flood control, Halstead, KS; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 2143. A bill to deauthorize the project for flood control, Salt Creek Lake, OH; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. McKERNAN:

H.R. 2144. A bill to establish a Ready Reserve-Sealift Enhancement Revolving Fund; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to designate June 9, 1985, as "America's Heritage Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to call a White House Conference on Library and Information Services to be held not later then 1989, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. HUTTO):

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to direct the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp to honor the 40th anniversary of the Blue Angels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LENT:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution to designate October 9, 1985, as "National Senior Citizens Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BURTON of California:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that public schools should be encouraged to include a study of the Holocaust in their history curriculums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FIEDLER (for herself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. KEMP, Mr. COURTER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STRANG, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MONSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. GREGG, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution condemning the actions of the Nicaraguan Government that hinder freedom of religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. MITCHELL):

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that corporate income taxes should remain graduated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President should take no action that will honor the memories of Nazi soldiers during his planned trip to the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should not honor the memory of those responsible for the deaths of millions by visiting the Bitburg Cemetery in West German; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H. Res. 133. Resolution providing that the U.S. Navy should not deploy nuclear weapons on surface ships; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H. Res. 134. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to restoring

the Wallop-Breaux Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. EDWARDS of California):

H. Res. 135. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should not visit the military cemetery at Bitburg, West Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 2145. A bill for the relief of Junior Achievement of Sacramento, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 2146. A bill for the relief of Peter J. Montagnoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 2147. A bill for the relief of Juan Macias-Arias, Margarita Radich de Macias, Juan Eduardo Macias-Radich, and Mary Macias; to the Committee on the Judicary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 21: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 22: Mr. SILJANDER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 43: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 62: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 119: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 237: Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EVANS, of Iowa, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. JOHNSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MONSON, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 279: Mr. STRANG and Mr. KRAMER.

H.R. 512: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 528: Mr. STUMP, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 593: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 610: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 820: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 821: Mr. WISE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 825: Mr. ANTHONY.

H.R. 831: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 864: Mr. KASICH and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 891: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VENTO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. FRANK, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 893: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 932: Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 968: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 1017: Mr. SWINDALL.

H.R. 1042: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1059: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. LUNGREN.

H.R. 1060: Mr. ASPIN and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1099: Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1132: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1136: Mr. RITTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DREIER of California, and Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1181: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1197: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 1129: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 1268: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1294: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H.R. 1318: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. WHITEHURST.

H.R. 1359: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1402: Mr. WEISS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1403: Mr. WEISS, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1430: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BOULTER, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1510: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1562. Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MONSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. UDALL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FISH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. COYNE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CHAPPELL, and Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

H.R. 1572: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1584: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. BEDELL.

H.R. 1591: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. STRANG, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1660: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1666: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1679: Mr. DEWINE, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1706: Mr. DASCHLE.

H.R. 1715: Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 1809: Mr. FISH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

H.R. 1815: Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.R. 1824: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1825: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1826: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1827: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1828: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1857: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1858: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1859: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1860: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1868: Mr. PENNY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 1894: Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1905: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. GAYDOS.

H.R. 1907: Mr. BENNETT.

H.R. 1908: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 1912: Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HOPKINS, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1918: Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PEPPER, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1965: Mr. BOULTER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 1997: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DYMALLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2016: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 2020: Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. COLLINS, Ms. OAKAR, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.J. Res. 105: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR., Mr. HANSEN, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. YATRON.

H.J. Res. 128: Ms. OAKAR.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. MOODY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. YATES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REID,

Mr. ROE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. WEISS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SABO, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.J. Res. 149: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SABO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BARNES, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FISH, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. REID, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WALGREN, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. YATES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GALLO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. COURTER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. PRICE, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SABO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. HENDON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.J. Res. 174: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, and Mr. BOSCO.

H.J. Res. 202: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. GEKAS.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. LUNDINE.

H. Con. Res. 74: Ms. FIEDLER and Mr. KOLTER.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. SMITH of Florida and Mr. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GAYDOS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MANTON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H. Res. 40: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. RUDD, and Mr. COBEY.

H. Res. 60: Mr. COBEY.

H. Res. 67: Mr. VENTO.

H. Res. 94: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H. Res. 112: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. REID.

H. Res. 127: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. MICA, Mr. LOTT, Mr. RUDD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MOLINARI, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MACK, Mr. CONTE, Mr. WOLF, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.