# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, June 24, 1986*

The House met at 12 noon.

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

We thank You, gracious God, that in a world where there is strife and division, Your Word gives hope for peace. We praise You that in a world where enemies threaten, Your Word is the word of reconciliation.

Give us, we pray, the vision of Your kingdom, where peace and reconciliation reign and give each of us the spiritual strength to be good stewards of that heavenly vision. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 261, nays 120, answered "present" 2, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—261

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Carr
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes
Hefner
Hertel
Hillis
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hutto
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Long
Lujan
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Packard
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schulze
Seiberling
Sharp
Shelby
Siljander
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
ge dm
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—120

Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Carney
Chandler
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hawkins
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Holt
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lungren
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McGrath
McKernan
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Oxley
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Roberts
Rogers
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Saxton
Schroeder
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Bryant
Tallon

NOT VOTING—50

Atkins
Bentley
Biaggi
Breaux
Campbell
Chapman
Chappell
Collins
Craig
Daniel
Dingell
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franklin
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gregg
Grotberg
Heftel
Horton
Hyde
Johnson
Jones (TN)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Leland
Livingston
Luken
Mack
Mavroules
Michel
Miller (WA)
Mitchell
Nichols
O'Brien
Owens
Ridge
Rodino
Roth
Schumer
Shumway
Sikorski
Stangeland
Towns
Weaver
Young (FL)

□ 1220

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 652) "Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill, joint resolutions, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 186. An act to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine by requiring that certain mail of the United States be carried on vessels of United States registry;



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

S.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating August 12, 1986, as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day";

S.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution to designate the weekend of August 1, 1986, through August 3, 1986, as "National Family Reunion Weekend";

S.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to designate the week of December 14, 1986, through December 20, 1986, as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Awareness Week";

S.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to designate July 2, 1986, as "National Literacy Day"; and

S. Con. Res. 152. Concurrent resolution authorizing changes in the enrollment of S. 2414.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT ON TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to meet during proceedings under the 5-minute rule on today, June 24, 1986.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT ON TOMORROW, JUNE 25, 1986, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to meet to consider markup of H.R. 1309 (the High Risk Occupational Disease Notification and Prevention Act) during proceedings under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, June 25, 1986.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SIT ON TODAY, JUNE 24, 1986, AND TOMORROW, JUNE 25, 1986, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule on Tuesday, June 24, 1986, and Wednesday, June 25, 1986.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4420, MILITARY RETIREMENT REFORM ACT OF 1986

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill, H.R. 4420, Military Retirement Reform Act of 1986.

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

There was no objection.

## MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1986, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4420, MILITARY RETIREMENT REFORM ACT OF 1986

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on the bill, H.R. 4420, on Wednesday, June 25, 1986, or any day thereafter, that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that said conference report be considered as read when called up.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO SIT ON TOMORROW, JUNE 25, 1986, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit during the 5-minute rule in the House on Wednesday, June 25, 1986.

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

There was no objection.

## TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS RELATING TO HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 652) to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 652) entitled "Joint Resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes", with the following Senate amendment to House amendment to Senate amendment: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert:

SECTION 1. Each provision of law amended by Public Law 99-289, is amended by striking out "June 6, 1986" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

SEC. 2. The applicable limitation on additional commitments to insure mortgages and loans to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act during fiscal year 1986 is increased by an additional $9,500,000,000 of mortgage and loan principal.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] to explain what we are doing here.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, hopefully this will be our last effort on an FHA continuing resolution. House Joint Resolution 652 has bounced back and forth between the House and Senate for too long a period and I regret that the other body has attempted to attach provisions to the extended resolution that should not be so attached.

The UDAG selection criteria has been added and insisted upon by the other body notwithstanding the fact that the House, in its recently concluded action on the housing authorization bill, H.R. 1, adopted the UDAG selection criteria by an overwhelming vote. The UDAG selection criteria provision belongs in the housing bill, not an FHA extender resolution, nor for that matter, in the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to House Joint Resolution 652, which I am asking the House to agree to, extends all of the expiring HUD/FHA authorities to September 30, 1986, and provides an additional $9.5 billion in credit authority for the FHA mortgage insurance programs. By September 30, I am confident that the housing bill will have passed and awaiting Presidential approval. Let us quickly pass this amended resolution so that homebuilders can conclude their settlements and others buy homes.

Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] has been most responsive and cooperative in bringing about this extension.

Mr. Speaker, I think the RECORD ought to show the House acted expeditiously, not once but twice, and the matter has been delayed in the other body for its purposes.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would return the compliment to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ]. He has been very forthcoming and very upfront on this issue. He has helped and cooperated in every way possible so that we could get a longer term extension of FHA, which we really need.

At this point I support this legislation extending the Secretary's authority to September 30, 1986, and increasing the credit limit by $9.5 billion.

As I said, the situation with FHA is very critical. When we had this bill up last week, the most important thing that we can do is to get FHA back in business while we work on legislation to increase the credit limit so as to provide for a long-term extension, to September 30, 1987; and I do have a bill in to do that, but today I suggest we go ahead with this proposal. We really do need to do it and I thank the gentleman from Texas very much for his very cooperative support on this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY].

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE] and say that nobody is very happy with this compromise; but in fact 10,000 Americans a day are being denied their mortgages, and it is putting a great many Americans into an extremely difficult position because they have deadline closing dates to make, and I am glad to see that we are finally doing something.

There are problems; it is not a long enough extension; it is not a high enough credit limit, but at least we have a time limitation.

I congratulate the chairman and I congratulate everybody for finally getting together on this one, but I certainly do not congratulate us on the time it has taken.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, the gentleman makes a valid point; that FHA has been out of business for 49 days now because the extensions have not always overlapped, and this has been very unfair to the home building industry, to lenders, to thousands of first-time home buyers who rely on FHA.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

## THIS IS NOT A PLATFORM FOR CHARADES

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

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the American people are no doubt fascinated with the latest in the Nicaraguan follies. We learned the President of the United States had requested the Speaker of the House to address the House of Representatives, and not the Senate—they are too busy—on the question of aid to the Contras. No doubt the President would find it interesting and challenging, we certainly would, to explain why the Contras need another $100 million for designer boots and to fatten their bank accounts in the Cayman Islands.

The Speaker wisely turned down that request and said that it would be all right if the President would come and answer questions. That would be very difficult, since there is not a seating chart in the House of Representatives for the President to call on us by name, but it would be a wonderful opportunity for us to be able to put questions to the President directly.

The latest twist was Chief of Staff Regan saying, on the "Today Show," that the Speaker was unhappy because his "call" disturbed the Speaker's golf game.

Now I can assure the American people nothing can disturb the Speaker's golf game because the numbers are so high it is beyond being disturbed.

I agree with the Speaker's conclusion: the House is not a platform for charades, this is serious business.

If the President wants to come before the House of Representatives, he should be prepared to answer our questions.

## LET'S TREAT PRIMATE MONKEYS IN A HUMANE MANNER

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. James B. Wyngaarden, needs to take a course in mathematics because he does not know how to count very well. Two hundred fifty-three Members of this House have signed a letter to him asking for the humane settlement of the issue of the 15 primate monkeys that are now being held at NIH pending the outcome of certain legal disputes with one of their grant recipients, the Institute for Behavioral Research.

One hundred Members of this House—and more are signing every day—have signed a sense of Congress resolution that these animals, who were willfully abused by an NIH grant recipient, be given the rest of their lives in a very humane environment in the State of Texas.

Not knowing how to count, Dr. Wyngaarden, is a serious mistake. We do not believe that these monkeys should be sent to the Delta Research Facility in Louisiana.

Dr. Wyngaarden and his staff need to seriously reconsider both the 253 signatures and the sense of Congress resolution and leave these primates where they are until this matter is resolved.

## CARDINAL OBANDO Y BRAVO DESCRIBES LIFE IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newspaper interview published in Panama, Nicaraguan Cardinal Obando y Bravo described life in Nicaragua and the ongoing war between the Sandinista Communists and the Contras. Cardinal Obando y Bravo said:

> If we are going to examine the situation from an economic viewpoint, we must admit that the situation is very bad because we make our purchases with cards. In Nicaragua, no one can buy what he wants, only what the state wants to sell. In the war aspect, there is a struggle against the groups that have turned against the government. The Sandinistas say that all the insurgents are former Somoza guards, which is not true. Among them are peasants and former members of the Sandinista front. We have the cases of Engineer Robelo and Arturo Cruz, former members of the government, and there is also the case of Zero, Eden Pastora, former deputy Minister of the Interior.

I am submitting for the RECORD the entire transcript of Cardinal Obando y Bravo's comments in today's extension of remarks. I urge my colleagues to consider the cardinal's assessment of conditions in Nicaragua.

## THOSE WHO REALLY PROFIT FROM AID TO THE CONTRAS

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow's vote on Contra aid will be followed closely around the world, but the audience paying the closest attention will not be found in the White House, not in the office of the president in Managua nor in the steamy jungles of Nicaragua. The most attentive audience will be huddled around a radio in a neighborhood grocery store in the capital city of Honduras. Because, you see, the last time Congress followed the President's request and appropriated $27 million in so-called humanitarian aid for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, a corner convenience store in Tegucigalpa in Honduras ended up with $3.8 million of

United States taxpayers' money. This store was set up by the Honduran military in mid-1985 specifically to supply the Contras and to make huge profits in the process.

All the stock boys and delivery boys in Supermercado Herman Pedro in Tegucigalpa will be listening closely to the radio tomorrow to see if the House of Representatives will allow Uncle Sam to be played for a sucker again.

## THE DOLLAR FELL, AND GREAT WAS THE FALL OF IT

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the Gospel says:

> A man had the sense to build his house on rock. The rain came down, the floods rose, the wind blew, an beat upon that house; but it did not fall, because its foundations were on rock * * *. Another man was foolish enough to build his house on sand. The rain came down, the floods rose, the wind blew, and beat upon that house. The house fell, and great was the fall of it. (Matthew 7:24:29.)

The Founding Fathers of this Nation had the sense to build their monetary system on the rock of a metallic dollar. Hot and cold wars came, trade wars erupted and beat upon the dollar; but it did not fall, because its foundations were on rock. Two hundred years later we were foolish enough to build our monetary system on the sand of a floating dollar. Hot and cold wars came and we were the losers. From the world's greatest creditor, ours became the world's greatest debtor nation. Embargo and trade war beat upon the dollar. The dollar fell, and great was the fall of it.

## WE NEED STRONG TRADE LAWS

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

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I took part in a community meeting in Birmingham, AL, in my district Saturday, also held in Mobile and Gadsden in Alabama and across this country, highlighting the crisis in the steel industry. Really there was a simple message that the community leaders, steelworkers, and others gave at these meetings: It is high past time that we had an effective new trade law for this Nation, that we put America's economic interests first and that certainly there is nothing wrong with standing up for America's economic interests.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed an effective bill out of this House. It is past time for the other body to consider legislation, pass it to the President; we need tough trade laws for America.

## CONGRESS SHOULD NOT LEAVE VETERANS' BENEFITS TO THE MERCY OF LAWYERS AND COURTS

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

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress should oppose H.R. 585 which intends to shift the determination of veterans' benefits from the Congress to the lawyers and the Federal courts.

Presently, the Congress authorizes all veterans' benefits. Representing the people of our Nation, veterans, and taxpayers, the Congress has provided a just system for compensating veterans with disabilities. This compensation is paid for by a grateful Nation for the sacrifices of our veterans and their survivors. The taxpayers want the compensation to benefit the veteran as fairly and efficiently as possible. Taxpayers want the benefits paid fully and promptly to the deserving veteran. Taxpayers do not want their hard-earned money diverted or diluted by payments to others, particularly to lawyers on contingent fee bases. Further, taxpayers do not want their taxes wasted by protracted litigation, court costs, attorneys' fees, and judicial expense. That's exactly what would happen if H.R. 585 was approved.

Members of the Congress should not leave veterans' benefits to the mercy of lawyers and the courts. The whole system of benefits, the relationships between the Congress and the veterans, and the cost effectiveness and timeliness of benefit payments will change dramatically if H.R. 585 is enacted.

Under that bill, a whole new and different, costly and prolonged, uneven and unpredictable system will develop. Only lawyers will prosper. Veterans and taxpayers will suffer.

## IF POLITICS ARE INVOLVED, THE WHITE HOUSE, NOT THE SPEAKER, IS AT FAULT

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are beginning to put together a bipartisan policy for Central America, one that supports democracies in the region with economic aid and continues the pressure on the Sandinista dictators by providing limited military aid to the Contras. The policy makes sense.

What does not make sense is the political debate in the past 2 days over the President addressing Congress on the subject. At a White House meeting I attended this Friday past, the President was not there, several Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, met with the White House staff to look over the bipartisan bill and to plan strategy.

At that meeting, I was asked if the President should address the Nation immediately prior to Wednesday's vote. Yes, I answered, we need his leadership if he endorses our policy.

I was then asked how that address should be presented? My first choice was a joint session Tuesday night. Second choice, poor second choice but a second choice, was from the Oval Office Monday night. And the third choice was a Tuesday session at noon with the House of Representatives. Because of lack of precedent and attention, the least attractive choice was Tuesday noon.

Our clear choice was the Tuesday night joint session. The White House response was that Tuesday night was out because the President had a previously scheduled fund raiser somewhere on the west coast, at which point I and other members of the meeting answered, "Nonsense; get your priorities straight."

We were told that the President would be consulted and that our strong desires would be relayed.

Now I find that Mr. Regan—not President Reagan—called the Speaker, that a joint session was offered by the Speaker but turned down by Mr. Regan and that the least effective, noon Tuesday, speech was then turned down by the Speaker.

Given the importance of the subject and the foreign policy implications, I think the Speaker should have granted Tuesday noon, but if there is any politics here, it is the White House, not the Speaker, that is at fault. The Speaker offered a joint session Tuesday or Wednesday night. The White House chose to say "no." That was wrong, and I wanted to set the record straight. The bipartisan package is a good one, but it is not helped by political demagoguery on the part of an often-incompetent White House.

## THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY TRAINING CENTER-WEST SHOULD BE REAUTHORIZED

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

Mrs. VUCANVOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the intent of H.R. 4252. However, I have grave concern about the proposal made by the administration and the committee to eliminate funding for the National Emergency Training Center-West. This western training center is to be built in Carson City, NV and the funds were appropriated last year. This center is very important to my constituents and to the economy of the

great State of Nevada. I am distressed that the committee did not recognize the importance of a western center and authorize the appropriate funds. I will work with the Appropriations Committee to get this funding reinstated.

The western center was designed to be a "sister" facility with the Emittsburg, MD, facility. These facilities were to be used by FEMA to implement all of their emergency training programs. The National Fire Academy operates out of the National Emergency Training Center in Emittsburg. The administration has requested that travel stipends be eliminated for attendees at the academy, as well as making attendees pay for their own lodging.

Although the committee does not agree with the administration, the recommendation for such a budget cut has been requested and will probably be requested in the future. If this type of cut is implemented, whether this year or next, the impact on the Western United States would be detrimental. For this reason, it is very important that the Western United States have a training facility close enough so the departments can afford this vital training.

The National Fire Academy has played a significant role in the fire safety training programs for firefighters. Career and volunteer fire departments cannot afford to pay the travel expenses associated with this most necessary training especially if forced to travel across the country. The direct result will be that only departments close to the training center will benefit from the expertise of the academy. The long term and most devastating effect will be a decline in the skills of our firefighters. This is reason enough to fund again the western center.

I believe the Federal Government should continue to take the lead in helping State and local governments develop the most effective measures in dealing with fire prevention and control. The U.S. Fire Administration has been extremely effective in this role and should not be terminated as requested by the administration.

We have given the firefighters of our country, whether they be career or volunteer, westerners or easterners, a most difficult charter. That charter is fire prevention and, in the event of fire, immediate control to save lives and the lands of this great country. We owe it to these men and women who lay their lives on the line for us daily to give them the leadership and training facilities that will enable them to carry out this charter in the finest manner available. I believe the funding of the National Emergency Training Center-West should be reauthorized and the construction started.

□ 1245

## WE NEED A STRONG IMMIGRATION BILL THIS YEAR

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was any doubt that we cannot count on Mexico's cooperation to solve the explosion of illegal immigration at a rate of about 2 million across our borders this year, these doubts were dispelled when President de la Madrid was interviewed Sunday on John McLaughlin's television show, "One on One."

President de la Madrid, in effect, washed his hands of the whole problem of the entire illegal immigration mess.

Mr. Speaker, we can and must bring our borders under control, but in order to do so, we are going to have to pass a solid, strong immigration bill this year that includes employer sanctions and a significant effort to increase the security and the integrity of our borders.

Mr. McLaughlin asked the President if his Government was doing anything to control the estimated 2 million Mexicans who will be apprehended after having crossed the border illegally this year. President Madrid responded, "The problem is structural. In the United States, there is the demand for Mexican workers, and, in Mexico, we are not creating jobs that pay enough for these Mexican workers. Thus, the key to solving the problem is the economic recovery of Mexico. There are no police, no coercive measures that could be effective in controlling this phenomenon. If there were no demand in the United States for Mexican workers, Mexican workers would not go to the United States."

Mr. Speaker, if we have to wait until no Mexican worker can get a job in the United States, it certainly will not be in our time. We have got to pass the immigration bill this year.

Each year, Mexico adds 800,000 new entrants to its job market while producing virtually no new jobs.

Looking from Mexico to all of Latin America, we find that between now and the end of the century, this region must create 4 million new jobs every year just to keep even with the current high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

Consider that during the halcyon days of prosperity for the United States in the 1970's, our Nation, with a GNP five times that of all Latin America, created only 2 million new jobs.

Where will all these unemployed go?

Mr. Speaker, there is only one answer: North.

## HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker. As I remarked last week, I would like to take time during these 1-minutes to share with the Members, headlines which have appeared in newspapers around the country regarding highway beautification.

Our Nation's highway beautification law has been in effect for more than 20 years but this law, which was originally enacted with the finest of intentions, has become, as the Burlington, Free Press captioned in August 1985, a * * * Victim of Bizarre Backfire."

"The Great Bill Board Double-Cross," quipped Reader's Digest in June 1985, which is the feeling many have about this law intended to control and eliminate signs along the interstate and primary system.

This "program to rid highways of billboards is [a] complete flop * * *", stated the Wall Street Journal in January 1985, and it may, in fact, be more properly classified as a program for billboard proliferation.

What's at issue is "billboards and America's visual pollution," as headlined in the Miami Herald, and that taxpayer's have to give money to polluters not to pollute.

More and more communities have taken up the fight against this visual pollution and, as the Houston Post reported in December 1984, "Regulation of billboards [is a] first priority."

"The quest to regulate billboards" as editorialized by the New Orleans Times-Picayune, is not an easy one, because, as the Wall Street Journal said in March 1986, the "Ruckus in Greenville, SC, underscores [the] power of billboard industry as [a] potent business lobby."

"Billboard industry eye local officials," commented Jack Anderson and Joseph Spear in May 1986, with campaign contributions and free billboard space as a way to reduce the regulating and curry favors.

But campaign contributions and the like are not reserved for local officials alone but have been used at the Federal level to undermine the national highway beautification statute.

## FEDERAL RETIREE COLA

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

Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060, which is intended to ensure a cost of living allowance for Federal retirees. I especially wish to thank Ms. OAKAR and the other supporters for their ef-

forts in bringing this measure to the floor of the House.

Since Social Security beneficiaries received a COLA this year and are likely to receive one in 1987, it is not fair that Federal retirees be singled out and denied the same protection against inflation. These retirees have devoted a good part of their lives to civil service, and now when they should be enjoying the fruits of their labor, they are instead faced with uncertainty as to their remaining years of retirement.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their efforts in getting this legislation passed.

## LET US HAVE Q&A SESSION WITH SPEAKER AND MAJORITY LEADER

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, we convened today at noon for the express purpose of dealing with a number of bills on the Suspension Calendar, and then one, as I understand it, that will be handled that is not on the Suspension Calendar. We are going to deal with a sense of Congress regarding human rights in North Korea and reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula; a sense of Congress regarding democracy in the Republic of Korea; Senate Joint Resolution 361, to disinvite Chilean tall ship *Esmerelda* from the July 4 ceremonies; the Lower Colorado River water supply bill; civil service retirement COLA; retirement credit to National Guard technicians; and so forth.

All these are important bills, I would suggest, but I cannot see that these were so important if they were put on the Suspension Calendar and that we, therefore, could not take time to meet here in the House of Representatives to hear an address from the President on the question of Contra aid.

Yes, it is a little different than what we normally do here, but it is important. It seems to me that simple courtesy ought to be extended to the President. To say, "Well, you can come, Mr. President, as long as you answer questions instead of addressing us," means we are creating a new standard here.

The next time the Speaker takes the floor, I assume the Speaker is going to allow himself to be interrupted for questioning. The next time the majority leader speaks to us for those long minutes I assume the majority leader is going to stop and respond when any Member asks the gentleman a question.

Evidently, we have a new rule here now. You can speak to the House if you are the Speaker of the House or the majority leader or the President of the United States, but only if you agree to be interrupted and answer questions.

Come on Mr. Speaker, we understand it makes good politics, but it does not make good Government.

## A DISAPPOINTING DECISION ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as a result of your decision and then the business of the House, most Members of the House today were not able to hear the President of the United States as he spoke on the subject of our future in Central America. I think that is disappointing. I think that we should have had the opportunity to have the President before this body and speak to us.

The Constitution of the United States in article II makes it very clear, in section 3, the President shall recommend to our consideration such measures as he shall find necessary and expedient.

That is what the President was trying to do. His constitutional duty was to bring something before us. Sure, maybe it was unprecedented. But maybe it was important enough for him to take an unprecedented action. He was turned down by the Speaker of the House. That is disappointing; I am disappointed.

□ 1255

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING THE QUESTION OF PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO FREEDOM FIGHTERS IN NICARAGUA (H. DOC. NO. 99-237)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California) laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, June 24, 1986.*

The Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting in writing my remarks that I had hoped to deliver to Members of the House of Representatives today. It was my desire to speak directly to the Members of the House of Representatives to emphasize the importance of achieving a bipartisan approach to address the urgent question of providing assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

Earlier this year the Senate passed a bipartisan program of assistance to keep the hope of democracy alive in Nicaragua. In the House of Representatives many Members of both political parties have worked together in support of a program that would promote democracy in Central America and to resolve the internal conflict in Nicaragua.

This program is embodied in the Skelton - Edwards - Ray - Chandler amendment to the Military Construction Appropriations bill and provides a balanced package of immediate humanitarian and military aid essential to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua. The amendment also provides much needed additional economic assistance to the neighboring democracies of El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, and Costa Rica.

It is imperative to our own national security and in the interest of long-term stability in our hemisphere that we support the forces of democracy in Central America.

It is my hope that this message will be received by Members of the House in the bipartisan spirit in which it is sent.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN AN ADDRESS TO THE NATION

THE OVAL OFFICE,
*June 24, 1986.*

My fellow citizens. The matter that brings me before you today is a grave one and concerns my most solemn duty as President. It is the cause of freedom in Central America and the national security of the United States. Tomorrow the House of Representatives will debate and vote on this issue. I had hoped to speak directly and at this very hour to Members of the House of Representatives on this subject, but was unable to do so. Because I feel so strongly about what I have to say, I have asked for this time to share with you—and Members of the House—the message I would have otherwise given.

Nearly forty years ago a Democratic President, Harry Truman, went before the Congress to warn of another danger to democracy, a civil war in a faraway country in which many Americans could perceive no national security interest. Some of you can remember the world then: Europe lay devastated.

One by one, the nations of Eastern Europe had fallen into Stalin's grip. The democratic government of Czechoslovakia would soon be overthrown. Turkey was threatened, and in Greece, the home of democracy, Communist guerrillas, backed by the

Soviet Union, battled democratic forces to decide the nation's fate.

Most Americans did not perceive this distant danger. So the opinion polls reflected little of the concern that brought Harry Truman to the well of the House that day. But go he did. And it is worth a moment to reflect on what he said.

In a hushed chamber, Mr. Truman said that we had come to a time in history when every nation would have to choose between two opposing ways of life. One way was based on the will of the majority—on free institutions and human rights.

"The second way of life," he said, "is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections and the suppression of personal freedoms."

"I believe," President Truman said, "that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

When Harry Truman spoke, Congress was controlled by the Republican Party. But that Congress put America's interest first, and supported Truman's request for military aid to Greece and Turkey—just as 4 years ago Congress put America's interest first by supporting my request for military aid to defend democracy in El Salvador.

I speak today in that same spirit of bipartisanship. My fellow Americans—and Members of the House—I need your help.

I ask first for your help in remembering—remembering our history in Central America so we can learn from the mistakes of the past.

Too often in the past, the United States failed to identify with the aspirations of the people of Central America for freedom and better life. Too often our government appeared indifferent when democratic values were at risk. So, we took the path of least resistance—and did nothing.

Today, however, with American support, the tide is turning in Central America. In El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica—and now in Guatemala—freely-elected governments offer their people the chance for a better future—a future the United States must support.

But there is one tragic, glaring exception to that democratic tide—the Communist Sandinista government in Nicaragua. It is tragic because the United States extended a generous hand of friendship to the new revolutionary government when it came to power in 1979.

Congress voted $75 million in economic aid. The United States helped renegotiate Nicaragua's foreign debt. America offered teachers, doctors, and Peace Corps volunteers to help rebuild the country. But the Sandinistas had a different agenda.

From the very first day, a small clique of Communists worked steadily to consolidate power and squeeze out their democratic allies.

The democratic trade unionists—who had fought Somoza's National Guard in the streets—were now told by the Sandinistas that the right to strike was illegal and that their "revolutionary" duty was to produce more for the state.

The newspaper—La Prensa—whose courage and determination had inspired so much of the Nicaraguan revolution—found its pages censored and suppressed. Violeta Chamorro—widow of the assassinated editor—soon quit the revolutionary government to take up the struggle for democracy again—in the pages of her newspaper.

The leader of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, Archbishop—now Cardinal—Obando y Bravo, who had negotiated the release of the Sandinista leaders from prison during the revolution, was now vilified as a traitor by the very men he helped to free.

Soviet arms and Bloc personnel began arriving in Nicaragua. With Cuban, East German, and Bulgarian advisers at their side, the Sandinistas began to build the largest standing army in Central American history and to erect all the odious apparatus of the modern police state.

Under the Somoza dictatorship, a single facility held all political prisoners. Today there are eleven. Eleven prisons in place of one.

The Sandinistas claim to defend Nicaraguan independence. But you and I know the truth. The proud people of Nicaragua did not rise up against Somoza—and struggle, fight, and die—to have Cubans, Russians, Bulgarians, East Germans, and North Koreans running their prisons, organizing their army, censoring their newspapers, and suppressing their religious faith. One Nicaraguan nationalist, who fought in the revolution, says: "We are an occupied country today."

I could go on, but I know that even the administration's harshest critics in Congress hold no brief for Sandinista repression. Indeed, the final verdict has already been written by Cardinal Obando himself in the Washington Post. Listen carefully to the Cardinal's words.

He says: The idea that the Sandinista regime "is a democratic government, legitimately constituted, which . . . seeks the welfare and peace of the people and enjoys the support of the overwhelming majority is not true."

To accept this as true, the Cardinal says, "is to ignore the mass exodus of the Miskito Indians . . . the departure of tens of thousands of Nicaraguan men and women of every age, profession, economic status and political persuasian . . . it is to ignore . . . the most terrible violation of freedom of the press and of speech in the history of our country . . . the expulsion of priests and the mass exodus of young people eligible for military service." As for the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, we have been "gagged and bound," the Cardinal says.

Many brave Nicaraguans have stayed in their country despite mounting repression—defying the security police, defying the Sandinista mobs that attack and deface their homes. Thousands—peasants, Indians, devout Christians, draftees from the Sandinista army—have concluded that they must take up arms again to fight for the freedom they thought they had won in 1979.

The young men and women of the democratic resistance fight inside Nicaragua today in grueling mountain and jungle warfare. They confront a Soviet-equipped army, trained and led by Cuban officers. They face murderous helicopter gunships without any means of defense. And still they volunteer. And still their numbers grow.

Who among us would tell these brave young men and women—your dream is dead; your democratic revolution is over; you will never live in the free Nicaragua you fought so hard to build?

The Sandinistas call these freedom fighters Contras—for counter-revolutionaries. But the real counter-revolutionaries are the Sandinista commandantes, who betrayed the hopes of the Nicaraguan Revolution, and sold out their country to the Soviet Empire.

The commandantes even betrayed the memory of the Nicaraguan rebel leader Sandino, whose legacy they falsely claim. For the real Sandino—because he was a genuine nationalist—was opposed to communism. In fact, Sandino broke with the Salvadoran Communist leader, Farbundo Marti, over this very issue.

The true Nicaraguan nationalists are the leaders of the United Nicaraguan Opposition: Arturo Cruz—jailed by Somoza, a former member of the Sandinista government; Adolfo Calero—who helped organize a strike of businessmen to bring Somoza down; and Alfonso Robelo—a social democrat, and once a leader of the revolutionary government.

These good men refused to make any accommodation with the Somoza dictatorship. Who among us can doubt their commitment to bring democracy to Nicaragua?

So, the Nicaraguan people have chosen to fight for their freedom. Now we Americans must also choose.

For you and I and every American has a stake in this struggle. Central America is vital to our own national security—and the Soviet Union knows it. The Soviets take the long view but

their strategy is clear—to dominate the strategic sea lanes and vital chokepoints around the world.

Half of America's imports and exports, including oil, travels through the area today. In a crisis, over half of NATO's supplies would pass through this region. And Nicaragua, just 277 miles from the Panama Canal, offers the Soviet Union ports in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The Soviet Union already uses Cuba as an air and submarine base in the Caribbean. It hopes to turn Nicaragua into the first Soviet base on the mainland of North America.

If you doubt it, ask yourself: Why have the last four Soviet leaders—with a mounting economic crisis at home—already invested over a billion dollars and dispatched thousands of Soviet bloc advisers into a tiny country in Central America?

I know that no one in Congress wants to see Nicaragua become a Soviet military base. My friends, I must tell you in all seriousness: Nicaragua is becoming a Soviet base every day that we debate and debate and debate—and do nothing.

In the 3 months since I last asked the House to aid the democratic resistance, four military cargo ships have arrived at Nicaraguan ports, this time directly from the Soviet Union. Recently we have learned that Russian pilots are flying a Soviet A.N.-thirty reconnaissance plane for the Sandinistas.

The Sandinistas claim this is just for making civilian maps. Our intelligence services believe this could be the first time Soviet personnel have taken a direct role in support of military operations on the mainland of North America.

Think again how Cuba became a Soviet air and naval base. You will see what Nicaragua will look like if we continue to do nothing. Cuba became a Soviet base gradually over many years. There was no single dramatic event—once the missile crisis passed—that captured the Nation's attention. And so it will be with Nicaragua.

The Sandinistas will widen and deepen another port while we debate: is it for commercial vessels or Soviet submarines? The Sandinistas will complete another air strip while we argue: is it for 707's or Backfire Bombers? A Soviet training brigade will come to Nicaragua. Half will leave and half will stay. And we will debate: are they soldiers or engineers?

Eventually, we Americans will have to stop arguing among ourselves. We will have to confront the reality of a Soviet military beachhead inside our defense perimeters—about 500 miles from Mexico. A future President and Congress will then face nothing but bad choices, followed by worse choices.

My friends in the House, for over 200 years the security of the United States has depended on the safety of unthreatened borders, north and south. Do we want to be the first elected leaders in U.S. history to put our borders at risk?

Some of you may say: this is fear-mongering. Such a danger to our security will never come to pass. Perhaps it won't. But in making your decision on my request for aid tomorrow, consider this: What are the consequences for our country if you are wrong?

I know some Members of Congress who share my concern about Nicaragua have honest questions about my request for aid to the democratic resistance. Let me try to address them. Do the freedom fighters have the support of the Nicaraguan people? I urge Members of the House to ask their colleague, the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who recently visited a town in Nicaragua that was a Sandinista stronghold during the revolution. He heard peasants, trade unionists, farmers, workers, students, and shop keepers all call on the United States to aid the armed resistance.

Or listen to the report from Time Magazine of Central American scholar, Robert Leiken, who once had hopes for the Sandinista revolution. He says: "I have gone to a number of towns in Nicaragua where I have found that the youth are simply not there. I ask their parents where they've gone, and they say, they've gone off to join the Contras." In Managua, Leiken reports, 250 Nicaraguans stood on a breadline for 3 hours. "Who is responsible?" he asked. "The Sandinistas are responsible," the people said. "The Sandinistas," Leiken concluded, "have not only lost support, I think they are detested by the population."

Can the democratic forces win? Consider: There are 20 times as many Nicaraguans fighting the Sandinista dictatorship today as there were Sandinista fighters a year before Somoza fell. This is the largest peasant army raised in Latin America in more than 50 years. And thousands more are waiting to volunteer, if American support comes through.

Some Members of Congress—and I know some of you—fear that military aid to the democractic resistance will be only the first step down the slippery slope toward another Vietnam. I know those fears are honest. But think where we heard them before.

Just a few years ago, some argued in Congress that U.S. military aid to El Salvador would lead inevitably to the involvement of U.S. combat troops. But the opposite turned out to be true.

Had the United States failed to provide aid then, we might well be facing the final Communist takeover of El Salvador, and mounting pressures to intervene. Instead—with our aid—the government of El Salvador is winning the war—and there is no prospect whatever of American military involvement.

El Salvador still faces serious problems that require our attention. But democracy there is stronger. And both the Communist guerrillas and the right-wing death squads are weaker. And Congress shares credit for that accomplishment.

American aid and training is helping the Salvadoran army become a professional fighting force, more respectful of human rights. With our aid, we can help the Nicaraguan resistance accomplish the same goal.

I stress this point because I know many Members of Congress and many Americans are deeply troubled by allegations of abuses by elements of the armed resistance. I share your concerns. Even though some of those charges are Sandinista propaganda, I believe such abuses have occurred in the past. And they are intolerable.

As President, I repeat to you the commitments I made to Senator SAM NUNN. As a condition of our aid, I will insist on civilian control over all military forces; that no human rights abuses be tolerated; that any financial corruption be rooted out; that American aid go only to those committed to democratic principles. The United States will not permit this democratic revolution to be betrayed nor allow a return to the hated repression of the Somoza dictatorship.

The leadership of the United Nicaraguan opposition shares these commitments and I welcome the appointment of a bipartisan congressional commission to help us see that they are carried out.

Some ask: what are the goals of our policy toward Nicaragua? They are the goals the Nicaraguan people set for themselves in 1979: democracy, a free economy, and national self-determination.

Clearly the best way to achieve these goals is through a negotiated settlement. No humane person wants to see suffering and war.

The leaders of the internal opposition and the Catholic Church have asked for dialog with the Sandinistas. The leaders of the armed resistance have called for a cease-fire and negotiations at any time, in any place. We urge the Sandinistas to heed the pleas of the Nicaraguan people—for a peaceful settlement.

The United States will support any negotiated settlement or Contadora Treaty that will bring real democracy to Nicaragua. What we will not support is a paper agreement that sells out the Nicaraguan people's right to be free.

That kind of agreement would be unworthy of us as a people. And it would be a false bargain. For internal freedom in Nicaragua and the security of Central America are indivisible. A

free and democractic Nicaragua will pose no threat to its neighbors, or to the United States. A Communist Nicaragua, allied with the Soviet Union, is a permanent threat to us all.

President Azcona of Honduras emphasized this point in a recent nationwide address. "As long as there is a totalitarian regime [in Central America] that has expansionist ambitions and is supported by an enormous military apparatus . . . the neighboring countries sharing common borders with the country that is the source of the problem, will be under constant threat." If you doubt his warning, consider this. The Sandinistas have already sent two groups of Communist guerrillas into Honduras. Costa Rican revolutionaries are already fighting alongside Sandinista troops.

My friends in the Congress: With democracy still a fragile root in Central America—with Mexico undergoing an economic crisis—can we responsibly ignore the long-term danger to American interests posed by a Communist Nicaragua, backed by the Soviet Union, and dedicated—in the words of its own leaders—to a "revolution without borders"?

My friends, the only way to bring true peace and security to Central America is to bring democracy to Nicaragua. And the only way to get the Sandinistas to negotiate seriously about democracy is to give them no other alternative. Seven years of broken pledges, betrayals, and lies have taught us that.

That is why the measure the House will consider tomorrow—offered I know in good faith—which prohibits military aid for at least another 3 months—and perhaps forever—would be a tragic mistake. It would not bring the Sandinistas to the bargaining table. Just the opposite.

The bill, unless amended, would give the Sandinistas and the Soviet Union what they seek most—time. Time to crush the democratic resistance. Time to consolidate power. And it would send a demoralizing message to the democratic resistance: that the United States is too divided and paralyzed to come to their aid in time.

Recently, I read the words of a leader of the internal democratic opposition. What he said made me feel ashamed.

This man has been jailed, his property confiscated, and his life threatened by the security police. Still he continues to fight. He said: "You Americans have the strength, the opportunity, but not the will. We want to struggle, but it is dangerous to have friends like you . . . to be left stranded on the landing beaches of the Bay of Pigs. Either help us or leave us alone."

My friends in the House of Representatives: I urge you to send a message tomorrow to this brave Nicaraguan—and thousands like him. Tell them it is not dangerous to have friends like us. Tell them: America stands with those who stand in defense of freedom.

When the Senate voted earlier this year for military aid, Republicans were joined by many Democratic leaders: Bill Bradley of New Jersey, Sam Nunn of Georgia, David Boren of Oklahoma, Howell Heflin of Alabama, Lloyd Bentsen of Texas, Bennett Johnston and Russell Long of Louisiana, Fritz Hollings of South Carolina, John Stennis of Mississippi, and Alan Dixon of Illinois. Tonight I ask the House for that kind of bipartisan support for the amendment to be offered tomorrow by Democrats Ike Skelton of Missouri and Richard Ray of Georgia, and Republicans Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma and Rod Chandler of Washington. This bipartisan amendment will provide the freedom fighters with what they need—now.

With that amendment, you also send another message to Central America. For democracy there faces many enemies: poverty, illiteracy, hunger, and despair. And the United States must also stand with the people of Central America against these enemies of democracy.

That is why—just as Harry Truman followed his request for military aid to Greece and Turkey with the Marshall Plan—I urge Congress to support $300 million in new economic aid to the Central American democracies.

The question before the House is not only about freedom of Nicaragua and the security of the United States, but who we are as a people.

President Kennedy wrote on the day of his death that history had called this generation of Americans to be "watchmen on the walls of world freedom." A Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said much the same thing on the way to his Inauguration in 1861.

Stopping in Philadelphia, Lincoln spoke in Independence Hall, where our Declaration of Independence was signed. He said far more had been achieved in that hall than just American independence from Britain. Something permanent . . . something unalterable . . . had happened. He called it: "hope to the world for all future time."

Hope to the world for all future time. In some way, every man, woman, and child in our world is tied to those events in Independence Hall, to the universal claim to dignity, to the belief that all human beings are created equal, that all people have a right to be free.

We Americans have not forgotten our revolutionary heritage. But sometimes it takes others to remind us of what we ourselves believe.

Recently, I read the words of a Nicaraguan Bishop, Pablo Vega, who visited Washington a few weeks ago. Somoza called Pablo Vega the "communist bishop." Now the Sandinistas revile him as the "contra bishop." But Pablo Vega is really a humble man of God.

"I am saddened," the good Bishop said, "that so many North Americans have a vision of democracy that . . . has only to do with materialism . . ." The Sandinistas "speak of human rights as if they were talking of the rights of a child—the right to receive from the bountifulness of the state . . . but even the humblest campesino knows what it means to have the right to act." "We are defending," Pablo Vega said, "the right of man to be."

Well Reverend Father, we hear you. For we Americans believe with you that even the humblest campesino has the right to be free. My fellow citizens, Members of the House: let us not take the path of least resistance in Central America again. Let us keep faith with these brave people struggling for their freedom. Give them, give me, your support; and together, let us send this message to the world: that America is still a beacon of hope, still a light unto the nations. A light that casts its glow across the land and our continent and even back across the centuries—keeping faith with a dream of long ago.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

## EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING DEMOCRACY IN REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 345) expressing the sense of the Congress concerning democracy in the Republic of Korea.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 345

Whereas over three decades ago United States troops fought shoulder to shoulder with the armed forces of the Republic of Korea in defense of Korea's freedom, and over 50,000 Americans gave their lives for that cause;

Whereas the United States continues to have a vital interest in the security of the Republic of Korea, as demonstrated by provision of more than $12,000,000,000 in economic and military assistance since 1953, the current stationing of over 40,000 American troops on the Korean peninsula, and

the existence of a bilateral treaty of military security;

Whereas the Republic of Korea, a friendly country allied with the United States, has made remarkable strides in promoting widespread economic prosperity and educational progress;

Whereas the security of the Republic of Korea is best ensured by deterring an attack by the forces of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

Whereas one element of deterrence is the internal stability of the Republic of Korea, which is best promoted by rapid progress toward full democracy;

Whereas the Korean people are clearly desirous and capable of participating in a genuinely democratic system without endangering the security of their country;

Whereas the February 1985 National Assembly elections constituted a significant step in the establishment of democracy in the Republic of Korea;

Whereas President Chun Du Hwan has repeatedly declared his intention to honor the constitutional restriction limiting him to only one 7-year term, which would lay the foundation for a peaceful transition of power;

Whereas free and fair presidential elections in late 1987 or early 1988 will provide an opportunity to realize the democratic aspirations of the Korean people;

Whereas a petition campaign calling for direct presidential elections has been permitted to go forward, and the Government of the Republic of Korea has indicated a willingness to consider constitutional revisions before the presidential elections; and

Whereas in spite of Korea's remarkable educational and economic progress, the Government of the Republic of Korea continues to restrict fundamental rights of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, as well as restricting the right of individuals to engage in political activity, and has resorted to the incarceration and in some cases, according to credible reports, torture of some of its political opponents: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)* That it is the sense of the Congress that the interest of the United States is political stability and human rights in the Republic of Korea would best be served by rapid progress toward a full democracy, specifically by—

(1) a dialogue between the government and the opposition, in a spirt of reconciliation, designed to resolve their differences and to facilitate the establishment of genuine democrocy in the Republic of Korea;

(2) the peaceful and democratic transfer of the Presidency of the Republic of Korea through elections which are designed, by agreement among the political parties, to give the Korean people confidence that the outcome of those elections reflects their will and wishes;

(3) guarantees for all citizens of the Republic of Korea of freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, and due process of law; and

(4) release of all political prisoners and the restoration of political rights for all those for whom such rights have not yet been restored.

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

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution both reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the security of the Republic of Korea and simultaneously expresses the sense of the Congress that further progress needs to be made toward the establishment of genuine democracy in that country.

I want to pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], who originally introduced this legislation, and who has been deeply concerned about and committed to the cause of human rights and democracy in South Korea as any other Member of Congress.

We will be hearing from the gentleman from Ohio shortly in the debate on this legislation, but I did want to take particular note of his very creative contribution to the formulation of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are few countries in the world with which the United States has had a closer or more intimate relationship over the course of the last three decades than the Republic of Korea. Over 50,000 Americans gave their lives during the Korean war in order to help preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of South Korea.

Since the end of that conflict, we have provided over $12 billion in military and economic assistance to South Korea. At this very moment, about 40,000 American troops are stationed in South Korea, some of them just south of the demilitarized zone. Because we have a mutual security treaty with the Republic of Korea, if another war were to break out on the Korean Peninsula our forces would immediately and instantaneously be involved. As a consequence, we have a very real interest in preventing the outbreak of another conflict on the Korean Peninsula and in helping South Korea to deter another act of aggression by North Korea against it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably fair to say that in the last three decades South Korea has made enormous economic progress. During that period of time a rather substantial middle class has been established in South Korea. Virtually, the entire population is literate. As a result of this growing economic prosperity and educational achievement, the people of South Korea clearly would like to now enjoy the benefits of democracy as well.

There has been, to be sure, some progress toward the establishment of democracy in South Korea in the last few years. Parliamentary elections took place in 1985 in which the opposition was permitted to participate. President Chun Doo Hwan has pledged over and over again to respect the constitutional limitation of only one term for the Korean President, which would make him the first President in South Korea to voluntarily relinquish power when his term ends in 1988.

The Government is also giving the opposition permission to conduct a petition campaign calling for the direct election of the Korean President in the 1988 election. And yet, for all the progress which has been made toward the establishment of democracy in South Korea, there is a lot that remains to be done. There are restrictions on freedom of the press. There are hundreds of political prisoners, and there are credible reports that many of those prisoners have been tortured by the Korean authorities. In the absence of further progress toward democracy in South Korea, there is a very real possibility that there could be widespread instability in the south. And if there should be widespread instability, it could conceivably tempt Kim Il-song, the leader of North Korea, to conclude that the time had come to fulfill his historic ambition to reunify the Korean Peninsula under Communist control.

Given, therefore, our interest in preventing another conflict on the Korean Peninsula, we also clearly have an interest in maintaining political stability in South Korea. At this point in the history of that country, poltical stability is best assured not by a continuation of repression but by real progress toward democracy. That is why this resolution calls upon the Government and the opposition, in a spirit of reconciliation, to enter into a dialog designed to facilitate the establishment of genuine democracy in South Korea. I am pleased to take note of the fact that such a dialog has recently gotten underway.

Second, this resolution calls for a peaceful transfer of power after the Presidential elections have been conducted, on the basis of an election which gives the Korean people some real confidence that their will and their wishes will be respected. We do not express a preference in this resolution for direct elections versus indirect elections, since we recognize that there can be fraudulent direct elections and fair indirect elections, or vice versa. We do, however, express a very strong preference that however the forthcoming election is conducted, it should be done in a way which gives the Korean people some real confidence that their will and their wishes will be respected.

Third, the resolution calls for guarantees for all of the people of South Korea with respect to freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, and due process of law.

Finally, it calls for the release of all political prisoners and the restoration of the political rights for those with whom such rights have not yet been restored, such as Kim Dae Jung and a number of other Korean leaders who have been active in the democratic opposition in that country.

I am pleased to say that this resolution enjoys very strong bipartisan support. The administration has indicated it has no objection to the resolution, and I believe that with a strong vote here in the House and with the at least tacit approval of the administration, this resolution will send a strong signal both to the Government and to the people of South Korea that their good friends, the United States, is on the side of democracy in that country.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 345, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding democracy in the Republic of Korea and calling for a dialog between the government and the democratic opposition to resolve their political differences and facilitate the establishment of a genuine democracy in South Korea. The resolution also calls for the peaceful and democratic transfer of the presidency through elections which the people of that country confidently believe reflects their will. Finally, the resolution calls for the release of political prisoners, the restoration of political rights for all those whose rights remain restricted, and guarantees of free speech, press, assembly, and due process.

The people of the United States value their special relationship with the people of South Korea. Our shared sacrifices during the Korean war plus the continued presence of some 40,000 United States troops demonstrate our commitment to the security of the south against the Communist tyranny of the north. And, as House Concurrent Resolution 347 which concerns North Korea's human rights record points out, the human rights picture in the north is far bleaker than in the south. Unlike the south, where lively debate is focused on how genuine democracy can be achieved, the north makes no pretext of engaging in such debate. The remarkable economic and educational accomplishments of South Korea also stand in stark contrast to the north.

While the Government's response to internal pressures for democratic reform has been somewhat uneven, there have been significant steps in the right direction. As the resolution notes, the February 1985 elections for the national assembly represented a significant step toward democracy and the government has, this year, also reversed its opposition to pre-Presidential election constitutional election revisions which the national assembly has already begun addressing. President Chun's declared commitment to honor the constitutional restriction against a second 7-year term also lays the basis for a peaceful transition of Presidential power.

On the other hand, we cannot ignore the serious problems which remain in South Korea, such as the practice of torture, the continuing restrictions on the political rights of certain individuals such as Kim Dae Jung, the incarceration of other individuals for the peaceful expression of their political views, and restriction of fundamental political and civil rights of free speech, press and assembly. The manner in which the government responds to these particular problems as well as the larger debate over the next presidential elections are not only a test of the degree to which the government is committed to democracy but ultimately has to do with the very security of the south inasmuch as failure to respond to the democratic aspirations of the Korean people could undermine internal stability in the south.

In recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia Gaston Sigur outlined what he believes to be the appropriate U.S. role in the context of these political developments. He called for a dialog between the government and opposition and emphasized the need for moderation and compromise. In addition, he said the United States should condemn violations of human rights and restrictions on political participation. The resolution before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 345, is therefore consistent with United States policy toward South Korea as articulated by the executive branch.

In closing, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for his leadership on this legislation of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, for his leadership as well in bringing this measure to the floor in expeditious fashion.

I urge the Members of this body to give House Concurrent Resolution 345 their unanimous support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning the need for full democracy in the Republic of Korea.

South Korea and the United States have a special relationship. Over 50,000 brave Americans gave their lives in defense of South Korea's freedom. During the past 30 years, our country has given more than $12 billion in economic and military assistance to that country. Today, thousands of United States military personnel are stationed in South Korea as part of America's commitment to defend that country.

Much progress toward democracy has been made by the Government of South Korea. It is clear that South Koreans are fully capable of participating in a true democracy.

We all realize that the 1985 national assembly elections were a significant step toward democracy. President Chun is committed to step down at the end of his term.

The Government there has permitted the petition campaign on presidential elections to proceed. These are positive steps which our Government must encourage.

We must never forget that the threat from North Korea is still very real, which is why we must continue to maintain United States troops in South Korea. In recent years, the North Koreans have undertaken aggression, subversion, and terrorism as part of a campaign to bring down the Government of our ally in the south.

I again express my support of this resolution.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot escape making the observation that we consider this resolution today under circumstances that are much different from what is usually the case when human rights resolutions of this kind are being debated. As a general rule, it would seem that these debates most often take place against the backdrop of political chaos and socioeconomic disarray in the country under discussion. But such is not the case with South Korea.

As the resolution makes note, South Korea has made remarkable economic and social progress during recent years. And while there have been some encouraging developments in South Korea's political evolution, there is some distance yet to go. This resolution seeks to encourage our South Korean friends to go that final distance toward the realization of a democratic political system that is commensurate with the tremendous progress that they have made in other fields.

I am very hopeful about the eventual outcome of the political dialog now emerging in South Korea. Even as this resolution was being marked up, President Chun was meeting with Lee Min Woo, the leader of the New Korea Democratic Party, to begin setting up the process by which constitutional revisions can be negotiated. This is a

very important and encouraging development.

I am personally persuaded that President Chun is sincere in his announced intentions to relinquish political power at the end of his term of office in 1988—and that he desires very much to bequeath to his country a peaceful, orderly, and legitimate transfer of power. Such would be a great legacy to leave behind. And the issue of political succession is made all the more important because the attention of the entire world will be focused on South Korea in 1988, as the host country of the summer Olympics.

The honor and responsibility associated with hosting the Olympic games have made the South Koreans ever more cognizant of the need to reform their political system in such a way that their country can assume its rightful place as an important member of the world community.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I trust the adoption of this resolution will be received by the South Koreans in a spirit of good will—that this resolution represents a sympathetic attempt on our part to encourage the continued development of democracy in South Korea. We value South Korea very greatly as a friend and ally, and we want what is best for all freedom-loving South Koreans.

Let us not be misunderstood, Mr. Speaker. Thousands and thousands of South Koreans stood shoulder to shoulder with Americans fighting in the Korean war. They died side by side. They are a front-line country against the unconscionable and despicable spread of atheistic communism. We applaud the South Koreans. They are wonderful people. Let us make sure we will always stand side by side with them in that effort.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the very distinguished, beloved and highly respected chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 345. This resolution, which was approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously on June 5, draws appropriate and timely attention to the situation in the Republic of Korea and provides clear encouragement for political progress there.

House Concurrent Resolution 345 expresses the sense of Congress regarding political change in South Korea. It emphasizes the need for dialog between the government and the opposition, the need for a peaceful transition to full democracy, and the need for guarantees of fundamental freedoms and for the release of all political prisoners.

Recently, the government of President Chun has shown a willingness to undertake measures endorsed by this recognition. Dialog is now ongoing between the ruling Democratic Justice Party and the opposition New Korea Democratic Party. For the moment, there is the prospect that legislative revision may open the way for direct presidential elections.

These developments deserve our praise. We encourage President Chun and his Government to undertake further steps—indeed strides—toward genuine democracy in the coming weeks and months. For events in the past year have clearly shown how much the people of Korea want a say in their affairs and want an absolute and immediate end to human rights abuses.

In this regard, the recent report of Amnesty International on violations of human rights in South Korea should prod greater resolve on the part of the Government. It is time for the political and civil rights of all Koreans to be restored and respected. It is time to end the arbitrary and unfair imprisonment of citizens wishing to express rights we in the United States take for granted. It is time for the revolving door of arrest and releases of Koreans on political grounds to stop.

Likewise, the practice of torture must end. Sadly, the Amnesty International report confirms what the State Department and other human rights groups have already documented: numerous incidents of torture and police mistreatment in South Korea. Many of us in the Congress have deplored such practices on other occasions. They remain unjustifiable for any nation but especially unbecoming of a country that is assuming such international prominence as the Republic of Korea. I urge the Korean Government to take immediate action to end this and other human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

□ 1310

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to one of the great champions of human rights in the House of Representatives, the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 345, expressing the sense of the Congress concerning democracy in the Republic of Korea. Acknowledging the serious human rights situation in this Asian country, and determining what measures our Government should take are actions which are timely and warranted.

Congress plays an important role in promoting U.S. concern for human rights by evaluating the human rights record of recipient countries when considering allocations for economic and military assistance. But monitoring human rights and encouraging democratic political structures throughout the world is an ongoing process which always factors into Congress' view of U.S. foreign policy. Resolutions such as this one indicate that we are serious about free and fair elections, that we respect freedom of speech and freedom of press, and that we will not ignore abridgements of these rights no matter where or when they occur.

The Republic of Korea has made some improvements in its democratization process. However, despite guarantees of rights in the constitution and President Chun's proclamations about defending and strengthening freedom, South Korea is neither fully democratic nor free from repression. The opposition, once comprised of students and laborers, now includes many mainstream Koreans, as well as several leaders of the Catholic and Protestant churches.

While the South Korean Government has legitimate concerns for the internal security and protection of its people against North Korean aggression, these concerns should not override its responsibility to uphold domestic and international human rights law. The United States Government has definite security interests in South Korea. It is this bond that has linked our two countries in the past, and will continue to do so in the future. But we have an even stronger tie with the South Korean people. Together we have fought against communism and oppression, and now together we must realize the fruits of our efforts—liberty and freedom.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for his leadership and perseverance on this issue. He has done a great service for not only the South Korean people, but the American people as well, I would also like to commend the gentlemen from New York [Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. SOLOMON] for their efforts regarding House Concurrent Resolution 345.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the author of this resolution, the gentleman who first introduced it into the House, a great friend of the cause of democracy in South Korea and elsewhere in the world, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and grateful for the interest and involvement of my colleague, Mr. SOLARZ, the

chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs in working on this resolution, and for his genuine concern, determination, and leadership on this issue of democracy in the Republic of Korea.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, Mr. YATRON, for his willingness to allow expedited consideration of this resolution which not only conveys the United States concern for the future of democracy in South Korea, but clearly establishes a bipartisan commitment to encouraging swifter progress in a number of crucial areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Republic of Korea has come to a critical crossroad in its short history. While the Korean economy continues to astonish the world with its growth and productivity, the political situation in that country makes headlines for its repression and stubborn adherence to authoritarian tactics. This is not only a sad paradox for the people of South Korea who have paid so dearly for their freedom, it is a dilemma for the United States because it pits our pride in Korea's economic progress against our dissatisfaction with the pace of democratization in that country.

This resolution attempts to encourage both the Government and the opposition in South Korea to work with speed to avert what could be a catastrophic confrontation over the election of the next President of the Republic of Korea.

The coming presidential elections in South Korea will be a litmus test for the future of Korean democracy. In light of the dramatic successes of the political opposition in the last year and a half, the manner in which that election is conducted and the success of its outcome will be critical to Korea's future.

Open to question are many aspects of the political process: How will candidates be chosen, and by whom? How much latitude will the press be given to report to the Korean people on the progress of any campaign? How free will candidates be to hold rallies, give speeches, criticize the current Government?

In the past, elections in South Korea have been conducted with severe restrictions on those rights. Only in the National Assembly elections of a year and a half ago did a significant shift occur, giving rise to the present debate.

It is certainly not our intent to dictate the manner in which this election should take place, nor is it our prerogative. But it is clearly our responsibility as a strong friend and close ally to express what should be the intent of any democratic election: That it be free. That it be fair. And that it give the people of Korea the opportunity to choose their next leader in a way which leaves no doubt that he or she has the support of the Korean people.

There is no doubt that the current system in Korea is inadequate to give the Korean people that assurance. Democracy cannot exist in an environment that restricts certain members of the political community from participation in the process. It cannot exist when the people of a country cast votes that may not be counted in favor of the candidate they support. And it cannot exist when the views of those critical of the Government are banned from the airwaves and restricted in the printed press.

South Korea has much to be proud of: A strong educational system and a dedication to excellence; an extraordinary economy that has set new standards for growth in the developing world; and a historical commitment to freedom from the bonds of foreign occupation and Communist aggression. These are the building blocks of a strong democracy and the foundation of our longstanding freindship with the people of South Korea.

I sincerely hope that this resolution will contribute to that friendship by sending a message of support and encouragement to the people in the Republic of Korea for their efforts to bring peaceful change and full, participatory democracy to their country.

I urge the resolution's adoption.

□ 1320

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who is a veteran of the Korean war.

Mr. GEKAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much enthralled by the tenor of the debate this morning on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last August I witnessed the Little League World Series that took place in Williamsport, PA. Now what in God's name, you will ask, does that have to do with the tenets of this resolution? The final game happened to take place between a team that had won the Far East championship, which represented South Korea, the Republic of South Korea, against the United States finalist, in that important final game at the World Series in Williamsport, PA.

If the Members of the House could have been there to see both teams saluting both flags, singing both anthems, joining in the festivities before and after the game, engaging in battle, as it were, on the baseball field, but symbolically emblazoning the cause of freedom by their very presence in an American free game known throughout the world as baseball, and symbolizing the best that is in America, that moment should be inculcated in the sense of this resolution.

The pride with which the South Korean youngsters played baseball on American soil and saluted the American flag, and then watched their American counterparts do the same for the South Korean symbol of freedom, that spoke volumes on what we are about here today.

We, and the South Korean people go back now in the cause of freedom a whole generation, and these youngsters who never even learned of that conflict except through their schoolbooks now have full exposure to the United States of America and know what we are about. We owe it to them to continue that framework of cowork and relationship that has existed these many years.

I intend to support the resolution and, Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members to come back to Williamsport when South Korea next comes for a championship game.

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Who won the game?

Mr. GEKAS. The South Koreans won the championship, the world championship.

I thank the gentleman, and I support the resolution.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very thoughtful appraisal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 345, expressing the sense of Congress concerning democracy in the Republic of Korea and I commend both gentlemen from New York [Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. SOLOMON] along with the bills' sponsor, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], in bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, Korea remains a divided country decades after the close of the Korean conflict. As much as this division of a nation must pain its people, the people of South Korea must thank their stars for the freedoms they enjoy and which the Koreans in the north can only dream of. Whatever the faults of the South Korean system, they pale before the barbarity of the government in the north.

I note Mr. Speaker that the House is scheduled, later today to consider H.R. 347, with regard to Human Rights in North Korea.

The people of North Korea lack even the most elementary human rights. They are subjected to a personality cult glorifying their leader, Kim Il Sung, in terms that would have made Stalin or Mao blush. Their lead-

ers live in luxury while the vast majority of the people live in unremitting poverty.

With respect to democracy in the Republic of Korea—South Korea, it is clear that the democratic process in South Korea is far from perfect. Many people have felt it necessary to take to the streets to express their views, feeling that they cannot have the desired impact through the ordinary electoral process. However, the South Korean Government is moving forward in its efforts to broaden the base of democracy in their country. They need encouragement, constructive criticism, and support from their friends in this country in that effort. Accordingly, I urge the House to adopt both resolutions.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering today, House Concurrent Resolution 345, makes an important statement about where the United States stands in the struggle for democracy and freedom in South Korea.

This resolution is a balanced measure and as such has received wide, bipartisan support. Congress is taking note both of the tremendous economic progress achieved by the people of South Korea and the slow pace of political progress. What is at stake here is consistency and the upholding of a single standard. This is not a question of unwarranted U.S. interference in the affairs of another country; we are already involved. We fought together with South Koreans to keep their country free. We continue to station troops in South Korea to guarantee its security. South Korea's prosperity is significantly advanced by its access to United States markets. Many of its young people study in this country, and the large Korean-American community provides a human bridge between our nations.

There are those who have said we must be silent in the face of human rights abuses and monopolization of power by the South Korean Government. Let it be clear that our silence is deemed to be acquiescence. We cannot proclaim our support for democracy around the world and then ignore the yearnings of the people of South Korea.

Congress is not dictating to South Koreans how they should formulate their political system. That is for them to decide. All we are saying is: give democracy a chance. Let those who would engage in political dialog express themselves freely. Our failure to take a stand will be interpreted by millions of South Koreans as a betrayal of the best hopes we share. Let us be true to our own traditions and the wishes of a vibrant and courageous people as we consider this legislation today.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 345.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

## EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA AND REDUCTION OF TENSIONS ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 347) expressing the sense of the Congress concerning the human rights situation in North Korea and the reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 347

Whereas the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (hereafter in this resolution referred to as "North Korea") is a one-party Communist dictatorship, in which there is a comprehensive denial of fundamental human rights—freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and freedom of the people to select their political leaders;

Whereas North Korea is a garrison state, allocating approximately 25 percent of its gross national product to military purposes;

Whereas the North Korean regime seeks to control every aspect of its people's life and thought;

Whereas the Government of North Korea is a Communist dictatorship based on a pervasive personality cult surrounding Kim Il Sung and his family;

Whereas opponents of the North Korean regime are deprived of due process of law and subjected to harsh punishment, reported to include torture and confinement in labor camps;

Whereas North Korea has demonstrated unrelenting hostility towards its neighboring country, the Republic of Korea, including the forward deployment of large numbers of troops in offensive formations near the demilitarized zone separating the two countries;

Whereas North Korea has tried repeatedly to penetrate the demilitarized zone, including the secret construction of tunnels and the deployment of commandos in the Republic of Korea;

Whereas North Korean security personnel attempted to assassinate the President of the Republic of Korea on October 9, 1983, killing 17 other persons in the process, including four members of the President's cabinet;

Whereas the United States has a vital interest in preserving peace on the Korean peninsula and in preventing an invasion of the Republic of Korea by North Korea; and

Whereas the United States is committed, under the terms of the Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea signed on October 1, 1953, to take all appropriate measures in defending the Republic of Korea against aggression: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Government of North Korea should cease its clandestine and reckless attempts to subvert the Republic of Korea;

(2) the North Korean regime should agree to measures that will reduce tensions on the Korean peninsula, including a more cooperative approach to the dialogue between the North and South, the genuine demilitarization of the Demilitarized Zone, the mutual and equitable reduction of military forces, family visitation and family reunification, and trade;

(3) the North Korea regime should take steps to reduce its international isolation by favorably considering the cross recognition of the two Korean governments by other countries and dual membership in the United Nations; and

(4) the North Korean regime should take steps to cease its abuse of human and political rights and deprivation of individual freedom.

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

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 347, expressing the sense of Congress concerning the human rights situation in North Korea and the reduction of tensions on the Korean peninsula. The Foreign Affairs Committee unanimously approved House Concurrent Resolution 347 on June 5, 1986. This resolution directs appropriate attention toward North Korea. Although we do not maintain diplomatic relations with North Korea and otherwise have very little leverage over the regime in that country, North Korean leaders should have no illusions about the position of the U.S. Congress. Our policy should be particularly clear at this time, as certain North-South contacts occur and North Korea seems to be reaching out for respectability and foreign contacts.

The international community was overwhelmingly appalled when North Korean

agents assassinated South Korean leaders in Rangoon in 1983. This incident only added to a sorry history of internal and international practices of that regime.

Yet notwithstanding ample reasons for caution, leadership on both sides of the demilitarized zone have approached each other. Despite the fundamental gaps between North and South Korea, we should add our encouragement to efforts to ease tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

This resolution makes clear our opposition to North Korean subversion and our view that North Korea should work genuinely to ease tensions and reduce its international isolation as it also must cease its abuses of human rights and deprivation of freedom for its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my very good friend, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer my strong support for this resolution concerning the tragic human rights situation in North Korea and the reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

The human rights record of North Korea is clear to all of us. That garrison state routinely denies the human rights of its citizens and seeks to control every aspect of life in that closed society. That Communist dictatorship crushes opponents and undertakes hostile actions against South Korea. The Government of North Korea even resorted to an act of terrorism in an attempt to assassinate the President of South Korea.

This sense-of-Congress resolution calls upon the Government of North Korea to cease its efforts to subvert South Korea. North Korea should undertake efforts to reduce tensions on the Korean Peninsula. It should take steps to reduce its international isolation as well as ceasing the human rights abuses of the North Korean people. Only than can real peace come to the Korean Peninsula.

I call upon my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay particular tribute at this point to my very good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who introducted this resolution. When we first began to seriously consider in our subcommittee adopting a resolution on the human rights situation in South Korea in order to express our view that further progress needed to be made there toward the establishment of democracy, the gentleman from New York quite rightly pointed out that whatever problems there may be with human rights in South Korea, they are dwarfted by the human rights problems which continue to exist in North Korea. He very strongly suggested that if we were going to move forward with the resolution on South Korea, it would only be appropriate to move forward with a resolution on North Korea as well.

I thought that that was a point which was very well taken, and I am pleased that he not only introduced House Concurrent Resolution 347, but that the subcommittee and then the full Committee on Foreign Affairs voted overwhelmingly to report it out.

I think that, in conjunction with the previous resolution that we have just adopted, it puts this House in a posture which enables us to take a balanced view toward the political situation on the Korean Peninsula.

This resolution clearly takes note of some of the egregious human rights violations which continue to exist in North Korea, and it also takes note of the destabilizing activities on the part of North Korea, ranging from their construction of tunnels under the DMZ to their efforts to assassinate virtually the entirety of the South Korean Cabinet in Rangoon a few years ago.

□ 1330

Like a number of the other Members of the House, some of my friends were killed in that incident, including South Korean Ministers whom I had come to know and respect over the years. I thought that was really one of the most dreadful acts to have taken place in international relations in a long time.

The resolving clause of this resolution specifically calls on North Korea to cease its efforts to subvert South Korea. It calls on North Korea to agree to measures which would facilitate a reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula, such as the actual demilitarization of the demilitarized zone.

It also calls on North Korea to take steps to reduce its international isolation by favorably considering the cross-recognition of the two Koreas by the United States and the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China and Japan, as well as dual membership of both North Korea and South Korea in the United Nations.

Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that this would in no way mitigate against the eventual reunification of the Korean Peninsula, which is an aspiration shared by all the people of that country, North as well as South. But clearly, if that objective is ever going to be achieved, it can only be achieved in the context of a substantial reduction in tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

Finally, the resolution calls upon North Korea to take steps to cease its abuse of human and political rights and its deprivation of individual freedom.

So I strongly support this resolution. I think it is a well-balanced resolution. I think, particularly in comparison to the resolution we have adopted on South Korea, which is a friend and ally of the United States, the rhetoric in this resolution makes it very clear that we do have a balanced perspective on the Korean Peninsula as a whole.

I think it will enhance the credibility of this institution as a parliamentary body, which is committed to the extension of human rights and democracy in tyrannies on the left as well as in governments which are inclined toward repression on the right.

When it comes to democracy and human rights, there can be but one standard, and that is the standard which we have upheld today through the adoption of both these resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] who helped to steer this resolution through his subcommittee and the full Committee on Foreign Affairs and who has come today to lend his considerable support to it.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 347. Human rights in North Korea are practically nonexistent, and yet, the flagrant violations of this Asian government continue to be ignored. Why is it that this Communist dictatorship can deny freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, and free elections without incurring constant pressure and scorn from the international community?

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I believe it is, once again, time to hold this North Korean regime accountable for its oppressive policies. It is up to the United States Congress to say to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that we know what you are doing—to your own people, to your neighboring country, South Korea, and to the prospect of preserving peace on the Korean Peninsula. The mere fact that this is a Communist country where grievous offenses are systematic and inbred does not lessen our responsibility to speak out against them.

Just as the United States must acknowledge and address the human rights violations of those countries with which we are aligned or have some shared interests, we, too, must not ignore the threat of aggression from those countries which perpetrate the downfall of democracy and the denial of individual liberty. House Concurrent Resolution 347 gives us an opportunity to make a significant statement to both the Government of North Korea and the outside world.

I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his interest in the human rights

situation in North Korea. As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, Mr. SOLOMON has continually demonstrated his dedication to the preservation of human rights throughout the world.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] for his evenhanded approach on human rights.

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

Mr. Speaker, my resolution addresses the human rights situation on the other half of the Korean Peninsula. I offered it as a companion piece to the resolution concerning South Korea because of my concern that we take into consideration the complete context in which the human rights situation on the Korean Peninsula must be viewed. In particular, no discussion of the contemporary situation in South Korea is really complete without considering the very serious threat that South Korea faces from its neighbor to the north.

Mr. Speaker, Communist North Korea has one of the most thoroughly repressive and militaristic regimes that has ever existed in the modern world. To a degree that is unprecedented even in Communist countries, the North Korean political and social systems revolve around one man—one all-pervading personality cult surrounding the person of Kim Il-Sung.

The denial of essential human rights in North Korea is so complete—so comprehensive—as to practically give new meaning to the word "totalitarian." Aside from the grim realities of everyday life with which the people of North Korea must cope, there are estimated to be at least 100,000 political prisoners languishing in Kim Il-Sung's jails and labor camps and any notion of due process of law is dismissed out of hand.

It should come as no surprise then that any such regime would be a destabilizing force in whatever region of the world it is located. And true to form, North Korea operates in a condition of total military mobilization with as much as one-fourth of the country's gross national product devoted to the military.

The so-called demilitarized zone separating the two Koreas is in truth the most heavily fortified national frontier in the world. North Korea, a country of 19 million people, maintains three-fourths as many artillery pieces along the DMZ as the United States does in the entire world.

North Korea's unrelenting hostility toward South Korea has been demonstrated time and again, from massive troop deployments in offensive formations along the border to the repeated attempts by North Korean commandos and other paramilitary forces to infiltrate South Korea and to dig tunnels under the DMZ.

Perhaps the most graphic and frightening evidence of North Korea's hostile designs was the terrorist attack by North Korean security personnel against President Chun and his entourage during his state visit to Burma in 1983. Not only were 17 people killed in the process, including four members of the South Korean Cabinet, but Burma's most important national shrine was blown up and President Chun himself narrowly escaped death.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is of vital importance to the United States because, as this resolution makes note, our country is committed, under the terms of a mutual defense treaty, to take all appropriate measures in defending South Korea against North Korean aggression.

I believe this resolution is an important and necessary complement for the resolution on South Korea. By taking into consideration the serious threat that South Korea faces from the north, we can better understand the situation on the Korean Peninsula as a whole.

I want to thank Chairman SOLARZ and Chairman YATRON and ranking member, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for their help and cooperation in expediting this resolution and for considering it in tandem with the resolution on South Korea.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

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

I would like just momentarily, if I can, to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for bringing this resolution to the floor this afternoon. As the gentleman indicated in his comments, it does bring an important balance to our discussion about human rights and the Korean Peninsula. That is a discussion that cannot be fairly reviewed, cannot be evenly considered, unless it does include the elements that are in this resolution.

The gentleman from New York has been an extremely valuable contributor in our committee's consideration of human rights problems throughout the world, but particularly in this area of the world, and his resolution brought to the floor this afternoon I think is testimony to that contribution and serves a tremendous goal for both the Korean people, and most importantly as well, for the fashioning of an American foreign policy that can be most helpful in their struggle for freedom.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he may consume to the distinguished ranking Republican on the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, a Member who has no peer in his leadership in human rights in this body, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 347, which expresses the sense of the Congress concerning the human rights situation in North Korea and the reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula. I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for introducing this resolution and the other gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, for his leadership in bringing this measure to the floor.

It is all too often that our legitimate concern over human rights in South Korea causes us to overlook the egregious human rights record of the Kim Il-Sung regime in North Korea. Although access to the north is far more restricted than access to the south and comprehensive information on human rights in the north far less available than the south, we do know, according to the annual human rights reports prepared by the State Department, that it is a rigid Communist system, to which all individual human rights have been subordinated. Not only is there no tolerance in the north for democratic political dissent, which is permitted in the south, but severe punishment is meted out for so-called political crimes against the State. Information in the north is tightly controlled as well and freedom of the press is virtually unknown. There are reliable reports of torture and mistreatment of prisoners as well as the use of labor camps. Over the years, the regime has engaged in systematic religious persecution and today continues to restrict the right of religious practice.

Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs Gaston Sigur, in recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, noted that military expenditures by the north may consume 25 percent of its GNP. There is no question that the aggressive military posture of the north represents a significant threat to the security of the south. The resolution before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 347, calls for an end to North Korean efforts to subvert the south and for North Korean support for measures to reduce tensions on the Korean Peninsula, including a more cooperative approach to the dialog between the north and south, the genuine demilitarization of the demilitarized zone, the mutual and equitable reduction of military forces, family visits and family reunification, and trade. Finally, it calls for an end to human rights abuses.

Fundamentally, however, the key point in these two resolutions on Korea which are being considered in tandem, is that there is no spot on the

globe, excluding perhaps the division between East and West Germany, where the contrast between communism and democratic capitalism is more evident.

Thirty-five years ago North Korea had a GNP and natural resource potential far greater than the south. Today, South Korea has an overwhelmingly stronger economy and, despite imperfections, a budding democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that this resolution is consistent with U.S. policy and would urge my colleagues to give this measure their fullest support. Few distinctions in the world give greater cause for reaffirming our values and foreign policy than the contrast between North and South Korea.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 347.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

## WELCOMING THE AFGHAN ALLIANCE

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 365) welcoming the Afghan alliance, 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. LAGOMARSINO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I am thankful for this opportunity allowing me to speak on the situation in Afghanistan and the visit of the delegation of the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen led by spokesman Burhanuddin Rabbani. In my capacity as cochairman of the Congressional Task Force on Afghanistan, I have been closely monitoring the tragic events of the past 6 years in that sorely troubled land.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Soviet Army invaded Afghanistan in December 1979 following a series of unpopular Communist coups. Their apparent goal was to support their puppet regime of Babrak Karmal and formally transform Afghanistan into another Soviet satellite. The result of this invasion, though, was mass resistance to this illegal Soviet occupation.

This struggle by the Afghan people against some 120,000 Soviet troops has been very costly. Millions of Afghanis have been forced to flee their homes and have become refugees in Pakistan and Iran. Hundreds of thousands of others have been indiscriminately killed and maimed. The Soviets have followed a scorched earth policy in Afghanistan resulting in the destruction of entire villages, crops, herds of livestock, and even irrigation systems. Because of this inhuman policy, many Afghanis are facing starvation. In addition, the Soviets and their unpopular Afghani puppets use torture, indiscriminate arrests, and hostage taking to subjugate the Afghan people, all well documented in the Ermacora report to the United Nations.

Last January, I visited Pakistan and my view was reinforced that despite these hardships, the Afghani people are determined to liberate their country at any cost. Leading the struggle are the freedom fighters called the Mujahideen. The seven main groups of the Mujahideen operate under a unified command and have the loyal support of most Afghanis. The Mujahideen are welcomed and provided for by the Afghan populace in all parts of the land. In fact, even in the cities like Kabul and Herat that the Soviets claim to control, the Mujahideen are active and popular. It is, therefore, not surprising that one journalist who traveled with the freedom fighters in Kabul equated them to the freedom fighters of the French resistance in World War II. The Mujahideen even have support within the Afghani armed forces. This is evident by the extremely high desertion rate. Because of the questionable loyalty of the Afghani Army, the Soviets often do not entrust it with sensitive tasks.

Despite this heroic resistance, we must not forget the size or power of the Soviet force the Mujahideen opposes. The Soviet Red Army is one of the world's largest and best equipped and while reports indicated that there are 120,000 Soviets in Afghanistan, there are thousands more, probably at least 30,000, readily available across the border. Against the lightly armed Mujahideen, the Sovets deploy tanks, guided missiles, rockets, and artillery. In the skies, the Soviets use the MI-24 Hind helicopter gunship and attack jets against the Mujahideen and innocent Afghani villages. There have also been credible reports of chemical warfare being used against these defenseless tribesmen.

Afghanistan has become the proving ground for Soviet tactics and weapons. According to the Department of Defense, the new Soviet SU-25 Frogfoot close support aircraft and later models of the Hind gunships have been combat tested on the Afghani people. The Soviets have also tested and now use butterfly bombs against young Afghani children. Thousands of children have been killed or maimed as a result of playing with these inhuman Soviet toys.

During my recent visit with Mujahideen leaders in Pakistan, I was struck by the determination of the people to regain their nation. Whether they receive external assistance or not, they will fight. If they run out of arms, they will fight with rocks until there are no more Afghanis left to resist. Fortunately, they have more than rocks to fight with. However, they are still underequipped and underpowered. They need weapons that will enable them to fight back against Soviet tanks and, more importantly, Soviet airpower. They need to be able to protect their farms and families from indiscriminate aerial bombing. They need the weapons necessary to present a strong, credible resistance against the well-armed Soviets.

While arms and military supplies are necessary to continue the struggle against the Red Army, we must not forget the plight of the Afghani people. An amendment to the fiscal year 1986 foreign assistance bill by Senator GORDON HUMPHREY and I authorized $15 million in overt humanitarian aid directly to the Afghan people. I recently learned from an aid that this money will be used to continue ongoing activities and fund projects in education, health, livestock, and commodity support.

Last week, many of my colleagues and I had the opportunity to discuss the current situation in Afghanistan and the needs of the Mujahideen with the delegation of the Islamic unity of Afghan Mujahideen led by spokeman Rabbani. My faith in and support for the Afghans' valiant struggle was reinforced by the frank, open comments of spokeman Rabbani. His courage and determination to eradicate his nation of its Soviet oppressors was clearly recognized by President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz, and my fellow Members of Congress. To commemoorate his first official visit to the United States and reaffirm our solid support for the Afghan people, I have

worked with Senator GORDON HUMPHREY, the cochairman of the Congressional Task Force on Afghanistan in the Senate, in formulating Senate Joint Resolution 365.

Passing this resolution quickly will further signal America's determination to champion the Mujahideen's cause and provide spokesman Rabbani with the warm, official welcoming that he and his brave colleagues deserve.

Again, Mr. Speaker, thank you for this opportunity allowing me to share my views on Afghanistan and express my support for Senate Joint Resolution 365.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 365, a resolution reaffirming U.S. support for the valiant struggle of the Afghan people and welcoming the delegation of the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen, led by Burhanuddin Rabbani, on their visit to the United States.

Although Mr. Rabbani has left Washington, I was honored to have had the opportunity to meet him last week and to join today in paying this tribute to him and his courageous people.

On May 1, 1986, the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs held a hearing on the situation in Afghanistan, during which the subcommittee heard afresh reports of continuing Soviet brutality and atrocities in that country. Yet despite these enormous adversities, the presence of some 120,000 Soviet troops and the more advanced technology of the Soviet and Communist Afghan forces, the administration told the subcommittee that there is "every prospect that the Afghan resistance will continue to become more potent militarily and better able to wage political war against the Soviets, both inside Afghanistan and in the international arena."

Against the backdrop of continuing military engagements inside Afghanistan, the United States continues to back strongly the U.N. negotiating process and to support a negotiated settlement based on the withdrawal of Soviet forces, self-determination for the people of Afghanistan, the safe return of Afghan refugees to their homeland, and nonaligned status for Afghanistan.

International opposition to, and protest against, the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan reached record levels last fall when the U.N. General Assembly voted by the largest margin ever—122 to 19—to demand the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country.

History is rife with stories of conflict and courage, but Afghanistan today represents ultimate proof of the unquenchable desire of mankind to live, work, and worship in freedom. Occupation forces may capture capitals and control for a time the machinery of government, but guns alone cannot capture the human spirit.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today, Senate Joint Resolution 365, was passed by the Senate on June 18, 1986, by a vote of 98 to 0, and I would urge my colleagues to join in this unanimous expression of support for the freedom-loving people of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from New York if he could briefly explain the resolution.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to explain it.

This resolution simply reaffirms the support of the Congress for the valiant struggle of the Afghan people and it expresses the welcome of the Congress to the delegation representing the Afghan people, led by Mr. Burhanuddin Rabbani, who was here last week.

□ 1345

The resolution has already passed the Senate. We had hoped to bring it to the floor last week, but due to the exigencies of the calendar, we were unable to. Nevertheless, we thought it appropriate that it be taken up now.

Members are all aware of the fate which has befallen the Afghan people. We know of their valiant struggle to expel the Soviet army of occupation from their territory. This is a struggle which has engaged not only the sympathy, but the support of men and women of good will throughout the world.

I do think it is important for us, over and over again, to make it clear that the Afghan people, who have heroically undertaken to resist the Soviet occupation of their occupation at a great loss of life and incalculable devastation to their country, and with over 3 million refugees, that their cause continues to enlist the sympathy and support of the Congress and of the people of our country.

I can think of few causes which have commanded more widespread support here in the House over the last few years, and I am pleased to bring it to the floor now, at the particular urging of my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], who is the "ambassador of the Mujahideen" to Washington until such time as they get control of their own government and appoint one of their own to represent their interests over here.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution welcoming the Afghan Alliance to the United States. The visit of Mr. Rabbani is truly an historic occasion.

As we all know, the crisis in Afghanistan i one of the great tragedies of this century. I 1979, Soviet troops invaded that poor country Now, over 120,000 of them remain and illegal ly occupy that once-free land. The Sovie action has created millions of refugees an many war-related casualties. The U.N. Gener al Assembly has called for the withdrawal o foreign troops from that country.

Against tremendous odds, the Afghan freedom fighters have battled against the Sovie invaders. Last year, the Afghan resistance formed the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen. This action marks a real turning point in the struggle for freedom. This month, the current spokesman of this new alliance traveled ot the United States. He met with the President and senior Government officials.

This resolution reaffirms our support for the struggle of the Afghan people and welcomes the delegation led by Mr. Rabbani. I wish him and his people well in their unified struggle against Communist oppression.

We must do everything that we can to ensure that Afghanistan never becomes a captive nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 365 and urge my colleagues to join me in approving this resolution.

We are all well aware of the historic struggle of the Afghan people to preserve their freedom and independence in the 6 years since the invasion of their country by Soviet troops. Last week, representatives of the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen made an official visit to this country to present to us firsthand an assessment of the situation in their country.

It is fitting that we in the House join today with our Senate colleagues to recognize this visit. We were encouraged at the organization of the Islamic Unity Alliance in 1985, a coalition of the major Afghan organizations dedicated to the overthrow of the Soviet occupation. The visit last week presented the American public with a visible indication of the courage and determination of these representatives of the Afghan resistance. In passing this resolution today we honor these brave individuals and indicate our continuing support for their struggle.

I urge support for House approval of this resolution.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. 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. 365

Whereas more than one hundred and twenty thousand Soviet troops currently remain in Afghanistan as a result of their illegal invasion in December of 1979;

Whereas these forces have decimated the nation of Afghanistan directly causing: the largest refugee population in the world, with three million Afghans living in exile in Pakistan; over one million war-related casualties; the internal displacement of hun-

dreds of thousands of Afghans; and deprivation and suffering for the majority of Afghanistan's population;

Whereas the most recent United Nations Human Rights Commission report concludes that the continuation of a military solution in Afghanistan will "lead inevitably to a situation approaching genocide";

Whereas the international community has repeatedly condemned the continued Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and has in seven resolutions approved by the United Nations General Assembly called for "the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan";

Whereas the Afghan Mujahideen have valiantly resisted the Soviet forces for more than six years, and have inspired freedom loving people throughout the world with their courage and determination;

Whereas on May 16, 1985, the Afghan resistance took an historic step by forming the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen, representing a unified coalition of the major Afgahn organizations dedicated to ending the Soviet occupation;

Whereas during the week of June 15, 1986, the current spokesman of this alliance will travel to the United States on behalf of the Afghan people to meet with the President and senior American officials: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States—

(1) reaffirms its support for the valiant struggle of the Afghan people; and

(2) welcomes the delegation of the Islamic Unity of Afghan Mujahideen led by Spokesman Burhanuddin Rabbani on the occasion of his first official visit to the United States of America.

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.

## TO DISINVITE CHILEAN TALL SHIP "ESMERALDA" FROM JULY 4TH CEREMONIES

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 361) opposing the participation of the Chilean vessel *Esmeralda* in the July 4th Liberty weekend celebration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 361

Whereas, Operation Sail has invited the Chilean naval vessel Esmeralda to participate in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration in New York Harbor;

Whereas, the Esmeralda is the notorious vessel used for the torture of one hundred and twelve political prisoners at the time General Augusto Pinochet seized power in a military coup in Chile in 1973;

Whereas, serious violations of basic human rights and civil rights continue in Chile under the Pinochet regime, of which the Esmeralda is an unfortunate reminder.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. The Congress deeply regrets the invitation extended to the Chilean vessel Esmeralda to participate in the July 4th Liberty Weekend celebration in New York City, and urges Operation Sail to withdraw that invitation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be transmitted forthwith to the Chairman of Operation Sail.

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

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES].

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

Mr. Speaker, this should be a noncontroversial resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 361 expresses the opposition of the Congress to the participation of the Chilean vessel *Esmeralda* in the July 4th Liberty weekend celebration. It follows a letter, cosigned by a bipartisan group of 59 Members of the House, to Lee Iacocca, chairman of the Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Centennial Foundation, and Ambassador Amil Mosbacher, chairman of the board of directors of Operation Sail.

The resolution was introduced in both the House and the Senate on June 12. It is cosponsored by a bipartisan group including Majority Leader DOLE, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman LUGAR, and Senator KENNEDY. It passed the Senate without controversy by voice vote on June 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman not to refer to votes in the other body or any action taken by the other body.

Mr. BARNES. I thank the Chair for that admonition.

Mr. Speaker, the *Esmeralda* was once the patriotic pride of the Chilean people and a symbol of the tradition of seamanship of the Chilean Navy. However, following the coup in 1973, the Chilean military, led by General Augusto Pinochet, ordered the *Esmeralda* used for the torture and imprisonment of more than 100 Chileans. On its decks and in its holds, scores of naked men and women were subjected to electric shock and mock execution, and were beaten and sexually abused.

Although the *Esmeralda*'s use as a prison was short-lived, General Pinochet's practice of torture and repression has not been. Almost every day, the newspapers tell of mass arrests, detentions, and torture in Chile. Even the Reagan administration, which had previously practiced a policy of "quiet diplomacy," was moved to sponsor a resolution in March of this year before the United Nations Human Rights Commission condemning violations of human rights in Chile. The participation of the *Esmeralda* in the Liberty Weekend festivities is not only morally objectionable; it flies in the face of the Reagan administration's own policy of distancing itself from the abuses perpetrated by the Chilean Government.

A recent New York Times editorial, entitled "The Interloper at Liberty's Party," put it correctly: "Tall ships are beautiful to behold and a splendid tribute to Liberty's birthday. But a torture ship has no place among them. It is unwelcome on these shores." I couldn't agree more with the New York Times.

The directors of Operation Sail have said that Liberty Weekend should not be "political." I agree. But I have to ask Ambassador Mosbacher, if he did not want politics involved, then why was the very same ship that brought protests to our Bicentennial celebration included in Liberty Weekend? The reasons behind the protests in 1976 have not changed, and neither has the repressive government that this ship represents. I think it is likely we will see protests again this year, as we just saw this past weekend when the *Esmeralda* docked in Norfolk, VA.

I urge my colleagues to join the Senate in its bipartisan message to those in charge of the Liberty Weekend festivities, urging them to withdraw the invitation to the *Esmeralda*.

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

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution not because I am opposed to condemning torture and not because I approve of present Chilean Government policy, but because I believe that actions like this should have some reasonable chance for success. Passing this resolution will do nothing to advance the cause of democracy in Chile or to resolve the longstanding human rights questions left unanswered by the Pinochet regime.

Withdrawing the invitation for the *Esmeralda* to participate in "Operation Sail" will not increase United States ability to influence an acceleration in the transition toward democracy in Chile. As a matter of fact, it could well be counterproductive. A critical element of moving toward democracy is getting the Chilean military to play a responsible role in facilitating that forward movement.

Does anyone believe that what has happened in the Philippines, the way that situation has evolved, would have been the case had the military and important elements of it not taken the action they did?

The Chilean Navy, as a positive influence on that process, can play a very constructive role; the United States should be doing all we can to reinforce the Chilean Navy's position so that it might take an even greater responsibility in helping the process of transition.

The exposure of the Chilean Navy to the celebration of liberty and democ-

racy will be multiplied by the impact on the Chilean people as the message of liberty is carried to them by the media coverage of this historic occasion. The stark comparison between the reality of democracy in the United States and dictatorship in Chile is bound to have an impact on the Chilean people and the Chilean military.

I understand the message that the sponsor of this resolution is trying to send, but I do not believe it is the message that will necessarily be received. It seems to me to be hypocritical to have welcomed the participation of the *Esmeralda* for our bicentennial celebration in 1976 but now to seek to exclude it 10 years later. Moreover, to seek withdrawal of the *Esmeralda* at the same time that ships from the Soviet Union, Poland, and Romania have been invited to participate is unquestionable applying a double standard to human rights protection. Although the Soviet Union has chosen to stay out of Operation Sail this year. They also participated in the 1976 bicentennial celebration. As great as the signs of the Pinochet regime may be, they pale in comparison with those of the Soviet Union.

Just as we would not help the cause of disarmament, freedom of emigration by Soviet Jewry and human rights in the Soviet Union if we had refused to invite the Soviets, we would have no greater success in promoting human rights and democracy in chile by blocking the participation of the *Esmeralda*.

The president of the National Maritime Historical Society, Mr. Peter Stanford, wrote in the New York Times, June 18, 1986, criticizing efforts to block participation of the *Esmeralda* in Operation Sail. He refers to our own U.S. Coast Guard ship, the *Eagle*, which was launched by Adolf Hitler and was named for a street thug Horst Wessel. Mr. Stanford writes, "we neither deny nor condone that background; we rejoice that the ship sails in freedom, to good purpose today." He concludes, "it would be infinitely more regrettable, truly, to start shutting out ships at our own initiative. That would be to betray the principle of openness that gives hope to the cause of liberty."

Our objective on both sides of this issue is to give hope to the people of Chile that their desire for liberty and democracy may soon be achieved. Excluding the *Esmeralda* will not help that goal, it will only hurt it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution, and by so doing, increase the impact of the celebration of democracy on the Chilean military and the Chilean people.

□ 1355

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly respond to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] just so the gentleman understands that the Soviet Union is not participating in this particular celebration of the Liberty Weekend. No ship from the Soviet Union will be taking part in this.

Let me also note that with respect to the ship, the *Eagle*, the gentleman is correct that that ship at one time sailed under the flag of the Nazis and has a history with which we would not want to be associated. But that ship now flies under the flag of the United States.

I am sure the gentleman is not suggesting that that is a comparable situation to the *Esmeralda*. The *Esmeralda* was used as a location for torture by the same government that is in power today in Chile, the same government that continues the same practices, torture and repression of its citizens, that were taking place on board this ship when this ship was a prison.

One of those who was tortured on this ship, one of those who was a prisoner on this ship is now living in Tel Aviv, Israel, and said, in an interview that was broadcast just last night on television, on "ABC News" here in the United States, that having this ship participate in our celebration of liberty and freedom would be like "having a floating concentration camp" participate in our celebration of freedom and liberty in the United States.

The gentleman says it will not advance the cause of democracy and freedom in Chile for us to make this statement, as our colleagues across the building did unanimously so recently. I would differ with the gentleman, and I would urge him to talk with Chilean exiles here in the United States and those who are prepared to put their lives on the line for freedom in Chile and ask them their judgment. Ask them how they would vote if they had the opportunity to cast a vote on this issue this afternoon.

I am confident the gentleman would get a unanimous response from them as to how they would view this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.)

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 361.

Mr. Speaker, as was the reaction of many people throughout the country, I was appalled to learn that the Chilean ship *Esmeralda* was invited to participate in the Liberty weekend festivities. Not only is this ship owned by one of the most brutal regimes in the world, but to make matters worse, the *Esmeralda* has been used to torture innocent men and women. Amnesty international has documented evidence to that effect which is universally accepted as factual. The critical question is why was this invitation extended. Clearly, steps must now be taken to have it withdrawn.

According to our Interior Department, Operation Sail, a private organization made the formal invitation, but reports have circulated that the Department of the Navy and the Department of State may have been involved in this embarrassing affair. I would like to think that the invitation to the *Esmeralda* was a glaring oversight which will be quickly rectified.

The American public has every right to demand that the *Esmeralda* not participate in our celebration of freedom and democracy. To that end, on June 4, I wrote President Reagan to ask that he take the appropriate steps to have the invitation to the *Esmeralda* withdrawn. At this point I insert the letter in the RECORD:

JUNE 4, 1986.

The PRESIDENT,
*The White House,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It has come to my attention that the Chilean Government's ship *Esmeralda* has been extended an invitation by Operation Sail to participate in the Liberty Weekend festivities in July. The sordid history of the *Esmeralda* and the fact that the ship is owned by a brutally repressive regime make its participation in our nation's celebration of freedom and democracy inappropriate and unacceptable.

The Pinochet regime converted this vessel into a prison in the early 70s. Amnesty International has documented information detailing brutal acts of torture committed against innocent men and women incarcerated on this ship. Whether or not the *Esmeralda* is no longer used for this heinous purpose is irrelevant. The Chilean government's deplorable human rights record is well known. Last March the U.N. Human Rights Commission adopted a resolution sponsored by the U.S. representative citing Chile for serious violations of human rights including disappearances, torture, and abuse by security forces.

To allow the *Esmeralda* to participate in the Liberty Weekend festivities conflicts with the ideals and values which the Statue of Liberty represents. In view of the U.S. Department of Interior's involvement with Liberty Weekend, I respectfully request that you take the appropriate steps to have the invitation to the *Esmeralda* withdrawn. This action would be consistent with U.S. policy with respect to Chile. Commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty calls for no less.

Your consideration of this request is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I have not as of yet received a reply from the White House and it my understanding that no decision has been made by Operation Sail. Thus, I think this resolution is a much needed expression of the American public's opposition to having this ship participate in one of the most patriotic celebrations in our country's history. I would conclude that the spirit of this

resolution is consistent with administration policy. Last March, the U.N. Human Rights Commission adopted a resolution sponsored by the President's representative condemning Chile for serious violations of human rights, including torture and disappearances.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that there are ships from Poland, Romania, Indonesia, and Panama that I do not hear anybody complaining about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, I had a chance to visit the ship, *Esmeralda*. I had heard of things that were supposed to have taken place on this ship, and I wanted to see what the ship was like and what kind of people we had on this ship.

Do you know who we have on the *Esmeralda* today? We have 18-, 20-year-old kids like the ones we have over at Annapolis. If you want to promote democracy in Chile, we cannot shoot ourselves in the foot. These are precisely the young people that we want to come to the United States, to see the Statue of Liberty, to see what our Fourth of July is all about, to see what our democracy is all about.

If we are going to promote democracy in Chile, we need people like that, not opposed to us, but on our side. I know of no better way of turning these young people against us, than to say, "You cannot come when we are celebrating our day of freedom."

I had a chance to talk to some of these young people on this ship. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] been on that ship?

I have talked to the commander. He is a third-generation Chilean who has been on that ship, who has served on that ship. It is true; this is the pride of the Chilean people. No one has said it is the pride of the Chilean Government.

We are trying to work with the people of Chile. We are trying to get them on our side. We are trying to promote democracy. I thought that was our purpose, to promote democracy in Chile.

Let us bring these young people up here and show them what democracy is all about. Let us see what kind of influence we can bring to bear on these young people. But to say we are going to take a swipe at you because we do not like your government, that is not very smart.

□ 1405

It is not very smart at all; it is like shooting ourselves in the foot.

I say, let us promote democracy in Chile, and all over the world, and let us get these young kids here and show them what democracy is all about. Let us not exclude them; let us include them.

Mr. YATRON. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATRON. I would like to ask the gentleman, has he talked to any of the people that have been tortured on that ship?

Mr. ROTH. No, I have not talked to any people, but I know the people that are serving on the ship now that were a year ago; and I am sure the gentleman has talked to some people that were tortured on that ship.

Mr. YATRON. I have not talked to them, but I have read reports from Amnesty International, and I feel that they are well documented.

Mr. ROTH. If my good friend will allow me, I have read a lot of things, too, and these things may all be true. I am not saying that they are not true; but I am saying we should be promoting democracy in Chile.

The way to promote democracy in a country is not by taking the people who are going to have influence; not by people who are going to bring about democracy in a country and excluding them: That is the way you turn them off.

The way you turn people on democracy is bringing them up here, showing them what democracy is all about. If we want to promote democracy in Chile, let us get these young kids up here. Let us show them what it is all about, and let us have some influence in this country and not deny those people the right to see what democracy is all about, the very people that are going to promote democracy in that country.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but comment on some of the remarks of the last speaker. I doubt that those young people will ever get off the ship.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 361 which expresses congressional opposition to the participation of the Chilean vessel *Esmeralda* in the July 4 Liberty Weekend celebration. This resolution is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 353 which was introduced by our distinguished colleague Representative BARNES. It passed the Senate unanimously on June 13.

The tall ship *Esmeralda* is a symbol of the brutal repression of human rights which characterizes the Pinochet regime. We in the Congress have on many occasions over the last 13 years deplored these abuses and urged the Chilean Government to respect the human rights of its citizens. Quite recently, the Reagan administration lent its voice to the international chorus condemning human rights violations in Chile. I welcome this development and urge the administration to continue its efforts to achieve an end to the practice of torture, the establishment of genuine democracy, and the full restoration of civil and political rights in Chile.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have before us another opportunity to express our opposition to the use of torture and the denial of basic human rights. The rededication of our Nation's symbol of freedom, the Statue of Liberty, is no place for another nation's symbol of repression. The celebration surrounding the Statue of Liberty should not be marred by the inclusion of a torture ship. I urge the organizers of Liberty Weekend to withdraw the invitation to the *Esmeralda* and I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 361. It is singularly inappropriate that the *Esmeralda*, a vivid symbol of torture and oppression, should be permitted to be part of our national celebration of the preeminent symbol of liberty in the United States.

There is a great deal of confusion in this body, especially on the part of those Members on the other side who have spoken. The respect and promotion of democracy does not involve having people look at a statue which says Liberty. What I think promotes respect and promotes an understanding of liberty and freedom is a demonstration by this country and this Congress that in fact we abhor the kind of things which occurred on the very ship we are talking about; not by the young people who are on it now, but by the government of General Pinochet, who was the President at the time that he committed that ship to being a torture vessel; a dungeon.

He still undertakes the same policies today. In 1985, there were 5,314 political detentions in Chile. In April of this year, 1986, the Chilean military and police carried out dragnet operations on at least 38 shantytowns. There were over 500,000 people between the ages of 15 and 60 who were detained.

The Archbishop of Santiago, Cardinal Juan Francisco Fresno, vigorously protested those raids.

The United Nations voted on March 14, 1986, to condemn widespread human rights violations in Chile, and the Government of the United States, at the behest of the Reagan administration and the President himself, joined in supporting that resolution.

The way you demonstrate what the celebration, this 100th anniversary celebration of the Statue of Liberty is about, is to have us stand up for freedom and democracy and humanity; not to pretend that all it is is a great big show. It is not fireworks; it is human rights.

To have the *Esmeralda*, that torture ship, participate in that celebration, is in fact denied the very purpose, the very basis for the celebration of human rights.

I would think that the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from California on the other side, would be the leaders in saying "The *Esmeralda*, that torture dungeon ship does not belong in the celebration," and I hope before this debate is over, they will in fact come to that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, the *Esmeralda* was the location of beatings, torture, mock executions, and sexual abuse of more than 100 Chilean men and women by the order of Gen. Augusto Pinochet following his military coup in 1973. In its notoriety, the *Esmeralda* has become a symbol to the people of Chile of widespread and systematic violations of fundamental human rights that continue to this day.

This is no time to ease pressure on the Chilean Government:

On April 4, 1986, the existing state of emergency was expanded to prohibit almost all public meetings by political parties and other opposition coalitions—Americas watch.

In 1985, there were 5,314 political detentions in Chile. This is actually an increase from 5,291 in 1984 and 4,537 in 1983—Ibid.

In April 1986 alone, the Chilean military and police carried out dragnet operations on at least 38 shantytowns, using heavily armed government forces with their faces painted black. In these operations, security forces cordoned off and occupied entire communities, rounding up and interrogating all men between the ages of 15 and 60. In the course of these raids, some 500,000 were detained. The Archbishop of Santiago, Cardinal Juan Francisco Fresno, had vigorously protested these raids—WOLA.

The United Nations voted on March 14, 1986, to condemn widespread human rights violations in Chile, the United States itself supported the resolution.

The Chilean Government has shown no signs of moving away from the military-backed 1980 constitution and toward genuine democracy. Under the 1980 constitution, the military would retain effective control of the government, and Pinochet himself would be in a position to retain the presidency through 1997. A broad coalition of opposition parities, the signers of the national accord, have called for a transition to genuine democracy before the end of the 1980's.

To the democratic opposition in Chile, the inclusion of this emotionally laden symbol of repression and inhumanity is an insult. To Lady Liberty, to our own cherished heritage of freedom, it is an affront.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while the invitation to tall ships to come to New York Harbor to help celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty is a commendable idea, the problem is that one of those ships, the *Esmeralda*, demeans the image of liberty, rather than enhances it.

It has come to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, from which our resolution was reported, that the *Esmeralda* was used as a prison by the Chilean military in 1973. On board that ship, men and women were detained and tortured, according to such authorities as Amnesty International.

Since the *Esmeralda* presents an image so totally at odds with the image of the Statue of Liberty being celebrated this July 4, the relevant authorities, such as "Operation Sail," should certainly withdraw their invitation. I have joined with many of my colleagues in signing letters expressing our point of view. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to underline our condemnation of the participation of the *Esmeralda* in this Liberty event.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in objection to this particular proposal on several grounds. First, are we taking it out on a wooden sailing ship because of excesses perpetrated by some people on that sailing ship? Or is there some broader significance attached to the resolution; and I think there is, based upon the Senate action.

According to Amnesty International, we have heard the reports of torture that occurred on that vessel back in 1973 at the time of the coup d'etat, but the Senate resolution describes the *Esmeralda* as an unfortunate reminder of serious violations of basic human and civil rights.

To be sure, it may be an offensive reminder. On the other hand, there have to be many other offensive reminders around the world. I am sure that no one would argue otherwise with regard to the Polish representation that will participate, and yet I would argue that when they honor that Statue of Liberty by participating in this great memorial service, that they are making a concession to values that we cherish and we would hope that the entire world would cherish.

I think that it is a mistaken effort on the part of the sponsors of the legislation to register a protest and maybe a very legitimate protest against excesses practice by any government on the face of this Earth that does not faithfully and completely observe human rights and self-determination of people.

At least we know that there is progress in Chile in moving toward reestablishing democratic government. But we know equally that in Poland there is no such movement, and so long as the Communists continue to maintain Poland as a satellite, there never will be. I would urge my colleagues to reject this proposal, however well-intentioned it may be by those who are disturbed over the human rights violations in Chile, and focus instead on the positive impact the rededication of the Statue of Liberty can have on freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would hope that we would support this resolution and commend the committee for bringing it before the House. It is inconceivable that we can celebrate the Statue of Liberty, the beacon of liberty that we cast throughout the world at the same time when in the shadow of the beacon of liberty will be the *Esmeralda*.

We cannot have this ship participate in this ceremony; not just because of the history of this sailing ship, but because of the history of the government that it represents; a government that today, as they have been for the last decade, have been engaged in the torture, the killing, the disappearance of their very own citizens.

For those who have sought to have liberty in Chile; for those that have asked for a democracy in Chile, they have been killed, they have been tortured, because they raised their voices. Now to allow this ship to come and participate in a salute to liberty and a salute to the beacon of the Statue of Liberty, is a farce.

It should not be allowed, and if this was to be amended to include the Panamanian ship and the Polish ship, you would find no objection from me, because this is our celebration, about our tenets, about our principles, for what this country stands for, and what we try to spread throughout the world and the hope that we hope out.

To allow the Chilean ship to come is a terrible, terrible mistake, especially when we understand also that this ship represents the very government that sent agents to this city to kill people, and in fact killed a Chilean citizen, an American citizen, in a bombing in Tenley Circle.

To understand that this was a terrorist action on the streets of Washington, DC, that was put forth by the Pinochet government that has judgments outstanding against it for those terrorist actions, in the year when

people are not traveling abroad to our allies, in a year when we are concerned about terrorism, here is a ship that will sail into New York Harbor, representing the government that has taken an action of terrorism in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. It makes about as much sense to me as it would be to levy legislation or a resolution against the city of San Diego or the State of California for the maintenance of a beautiful sailing ship, used in the slave traffic, the *Star of India*, which is docked in San Diego; but we would not do that because that would be interfering with the governments on the local level, and we depend on them to help us come back here, I suppose.

In any case, this is a direct intervention into the affairs of a sovereign nation; it is a damning thing to the national pride of another sovereign nation. What we are attempting to do, it seems to me, is to inspire revolution against the government there, knowing full well that the choice would be not for a democratic government, but for another Communist takeover.

We have never leveled resolutions or prohibitions against the Soviet Union for the interference that it promotes in the way of torture, death, et cetera, against the countries of Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Vietnam, and Korea and some of the countries of Africa, and now in Afghanistan.

□ 1415

So we do not raise our voices where we see brutality elsewhere in the world in the Communist countries or the Iron Curtain countries; we raise our voices against potential friends in our own hemisphere.

Chile's coastline is the longest coastline on the Pacific Coast of South America. We depend on Chile for the protection of that coastline for our future, not only economically but in case of war, should the Panama Canal be removed as a pathway between the two oceans. So it seems to me that this is an amendment that does not help our country at all. It tells a very proud people that we are in a position to keep them from viewing what democracy is all about, from even having a view of the Statue of Liberty, which represents freedom and liberty throughout the world as a hallmark of that. I would just say that I oppose this because the young people who train on this vessel are much like the young people who train on the *La Libertad*, and I have been aboard that ship. It is sort of a sister ship, but it belongs to Argentina, and it will be coming to visit New York. It has a lot of records for its fast sailing ability, it has trained a lot of seaman, a lot of officers. It acts as a training ship just as the *Esmeralda* does, and I would hope that especially on a suspension order that we reject this, if we had nothing else to show that we do respect the people of Chile and we do respect what they would like to do.

I talked to some of the opposition leaders in Chile, and they have no plan by which they could govern if they were allowed to govern. And the people who are running the government now, many of them in the military, have told me they would like to get back to the barracks. But these people have told me they have no way of assuming power. They have no responsibility of doing that, and until they find someone or a group or a plan that would be able to govern reasonably in that country, the military will retain its power there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. It seems to me clear that a ship on which unspeakable violations of human rights have occurred should not be allowed to participate in the celebration of liberty. The argument made by some who oppose this resolution is that ships representing other governments that do not honor human rights are being permitted to participate in this celebration, and that is certainly correct. They argue from that that the Chilean Government is being singled out. But that, I think, is wrong because the fact of the matter is that there has been no showing that any other ship that has been invited to participate has, itself, been used as a prison to torture people. That is what we are talking about here. We are talking about the fact that the *Esmeralda* was used as a prison by the Chilean military in 1973. We are talking about the fact that some 110 men and women were detained and tortured on board the *Esmeralda*. We are talking about the fact that respected international human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights have collected testimony from victims of torture aboard the *Esmeralda*. We are talking about the fact that those tortures included electric shock, sexual abuse, and mock executions. That is what this ship stands for. Is that what we want in New York Harbor on the day that we celebrate the centennial of the Statue of Liberty?

As the Member of Congress in whose congressional district the Statue of Liberty lies, that is not what I want to see at that festival.

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, 70 years ago my own grandmother and grandfather arrived in the Port of New York and sailed past Lady Liberty. I will never know, indeed most of you will never know, the feelings of our ancestors on those special days that marked the beginning of our experience with America; never know their hopes, their dreams or what America meant for them.

But I ask you this, for my family and for yours, let us try. On July 4th, let us try to relive what it is they felt because, you see, on that day we will be celebrating the triumph not only of our own people or of our own ancestors but indeed of all mankind.

This is not the 100th anniversary of a government, of a country, it is the celebration of something much larger, an idea, liberty.

This is the celebration we open to the world, not just our people but all people. The price of admission is simple: if you come, you need not agree with America on all things, you need to share but one concept, you believe in liberty.

Help us make this celebration all that it might be. For all of us for whom that day has special meaning, let it be a day of liberty.

Let those who come share in it. That is what this resolution is all about.

Please, my colleagues, make this day all that it might be for all those who came from so far believing in that special idea, liberty.

I congratulate my colleague for offering the amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this resolution which requests that the invitation for the Chilean ship *Esmeralda* to participate in July 4 celebrations be withdrawn.

The *Esmeralda* was allegedly used to imprison and torture political prisoners in Chile after General Pinochet took power. Although all of us can condemn violations of human rights, there is no definite proof that the vessel was in fact used for those purposes. General Pinochet has also denied that the *Esmeralda* was ever used for such activities. The Chilean Government insists that the ship has always been used as a training ship.

Our Government is working very closely with the Government of the Chile to resolve the human rights issues in that country. Withdrawing an invitation to a sailing ship contributes nothing to the important work that is being done to improve basic human rights in that country.

The *Esmeralda* is one of the world's great sailing ships and one of the largest in the Western Hemisphere. The ship has been invited to participate in Operation Sail not as a representative of the Government of Chile, but as a unique sailing vessel.

71-059 O-87-15 (Pt. 11)

The ship has already arrived in Norfolk Harbor. It is clearly too late to disinvite the *Esmeralda* from participating in the event. Why snub the captain and the young crew of a training vessel for sins allegedly committed in the past?

I call upon my colleagues to join me in opposing this ill-timed resolution.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to protest the inclusion of the Chilean ship, the *Esmeralda*, in the July 4 Liberty Weekend celebration in New York City. By all accounts, the *Esmeralda* is a glorious ship; her beauty and her majesty are stunning even when compared to her sister ships. But, the *Esmeralda* has a sinister past that pristine sails and elegant bearing cannot conceal. In the aftermath of the bloody coup of General Pinochet in Chile, this ship was used to imprison and to torture Chilean citizens.

How then, Mr. Speaker, can we permit a ship that for so many is a reminder of pain and suffering to join in a celebration of freedom and good will? How can we compromise a testimonial to democracy by playing host to so egregious a symbol of repression as the *Esmeralda?* And, finally, Mr. Speaker, how can we purport to honor the Statue of Liberty and still ask her to welcome to our own shores so dreadful a reminder of loss of liberty and honor?

The beauty of the *Esmeralda* is besmirched by her own past and by a government that uses terror, repression and brutality to sustain, illegally, its control of a brave and proud nation.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should fully withdraw the invitation to the *Esmeralda* to visit New York Harbor. Indeed, we must ask her to wait; she must sail away now so that one day, when Chile is again a free and democratic society, we can welcome the *Esmeralda* to our shores with dignity and with admiration. Some day, she will be a symbol of redressed wrongs and she will be a reminder of the courage and the forbearance of Chilean heroes. Until that day, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in the House and in the other body who also believe that the *Esmeralda* has no place in our July 4, 1986, Liberty Weekend festivities.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 361).

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

---

## LOWER COLORADO WATER SUPPLY ACT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5028) entitled the "Lower Colorado Water Supply Act," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5028

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION.

SECTION 1. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate and maintain the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project, California in order to supply water for domestic, municipal, industrial and recreational purposes only. Such project shall be constructed substantially in accordance with the plans set forth in the document entitled "Lower Colorado Water Supply Study, California" (December, 1985): *Provided,* That the Secretary is prohibited from constructing facilities with a total capacity in excess of 10,000 acre feet per annum under authority of this Act.

(b)(1) The Secretary is further authorized to enter into exchange contracts and take such actions as the Secretary deems appropriate to facilitate a water exchange agreement between non-Federal interests and those interests designated in Section 2(b) of this Act in which such non-Federal interests agree to exchange a portion of their rights to divert water from the Colorado River for an equivalent quantity and quality of groundwater to be withdrawn from a wellfield located in the Sand Hills area, Imperial County, California.

(2) The Secretary is prohibited from executing any contracts under the authority of subsection b(1) of this section until such contracts have been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and 90 calendar days have elapsed.

SEC. 2. REPAYMENT OF COSTS.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary is prohibited from obligating or expending any of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 3 of this Act until—

(1) a study has been completed, and submitted to the appropriate committees of the Congress, allocating among the Federal and non-Federal beneficiaries the capital costs and the costs of operating, maintaining and replacing the project authorized by section 1 of this Act;

(2) the Secretary has entered into a contract or contracts with non-Federal interests for repayment of the capital costs, plus interest, allocated to non-Federal interests for municipal and industrial purposes as identified in the cost allocation study prepared under subsection a(1): *Provided,* That the terms and provisions of such contracts and repayment shall be governed by the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958 which were in effect on January 1, 1986; and,

(3) the Secretary has entered into a contract or contracts with non-Federal interest for payment of 100 per centum of the costs allocated to such non-Federal interests for the operation, maintenance and replacement of the project.

(b) Any contracts executed by the Secretary to fulfill the requirements of subsections a(2) and a(3) of this section must be with persons, or Federal or non-Federal governmental entities whose lands or interests in lands are located adjacent to the Colorado River in the State of California who do not hold rights to Colorado River water or whose rights are insufficient to meet their present or anticipated future needs, as determined by the Secretary. Such persons, or Federal or non-Federal governmental entities shall include the City of Needles, the town of Winterhaven, and other domestic, municipal, industrial and recreational water users along the Colorado River in the State of California.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Lower Colorado Water Supply Project through September 30, 1991 the sum of $1,800,000, such sums to remain available until expended. There is further authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years through September 30, 1991, the sum of $100,000 for the operation, maintenance and replacement of that portion of the Project used to supply municipal, industrial or recreational water supplies for lands managed by the Federal government. No funds are authorized to be appropriated for payment of the operation, maintenance or replacement costs allocated to non-Federal beneficiaries as determined by the study undertaken under authority of section 2(a)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. STRANG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5028 is a noncontroversial but important bill which will assure an adequate supply of domestic and municipal water for thousands of persons living along the lower Colorado River in California.

Despite years of negotiations and lawsuits, and hundreds of millions of dollars of water storage projects, there are still Federal recreation lands, towns, and individuals along the California side of the lower Colorado River who do not have a firm and legal water supply.

These water users, including those who withdraw river water by underground pumping, will soon be required to terminate their use of the Colorado River unless another supply can be provided for them. There simply won't be enough water to go around once the Central Arizona Project becomes fully operational.

Under the terms of Arizona versus California and Federal criteria governing river operations, California has been allowed all the river water it could beneficially use until the CAP began operation. After the CAP began making deliveries last year, California has been and will be limited to its annual 4.4 million acre-feet of basic apportionment except in years of surplus flow.

Affected users who would have to give up their current water supply include: the Bureau of Land Management, which leases valuable recreational lands along the river; the city of Needles and the town of Winterhaven, both rapidly growing retirement communities; and other independent water users.

In 1980, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study evaluating alternative ways to supply up to a maximum of 10,000 acre-feet of water per year to these water users. H.R. 5028 would authorize construction of the project recommended in that study.

The project is simple and inexpensive. A small well field would be constructed along the All American Canal, which carries Colorado River water to the Imperial and Coachella Irrigation Districts. The wells would pump seepage water from the canal which has accumulated underground, and this water would be discharged back into the canal. In return, a like amount of Colorado River water would be available for use by the noncontract users along the river in California. Exchange agreements among the various water users would be executed to allow this swapping of water supplies.

The ground water basin under the All American Canal is the key to this project. It contains several million acre-feet of water and could provide a firm water supply for the noncontract water users for many years.

The capital, operation, and maintenance costs of this project allocated to non-Federal entities will be repaid in full, with interest under the terms of the Water Supply Act of 1958. There will be no irrigation water supplied by this project—just domestic and municipal and industrial water.

The appropriations authorized by H.R. 5028 total $1,800,000 through 1991. In addition, $100,000 per year through 1991 are authorized for O&M expenses allocated to the Federal lands which would be supplied by this project.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5028 will close another chapter in the long and complicated process of allocating the limited water from the Colorado River. This project enjoys wide support, and I am not aware of any opposition. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5028.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide a long-term solution to the water supply needs of the small, relatively isolated communities along the California side of the lower Colorado River, and to the Federal agencies which manage lands in these areas, who have no alternative source of water supply. In this way, we can solve a significant water resources management problem, and also resolve one of the troubling remaining issues which resulted from the decades long litigation in Arizona versus California. This is a noncontroversial measure and deserves your support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

□ 1430

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin my remarks by indicating to the House that both the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, and their very fine staffs have been more than helpful in solving what is a very important problem to relatively few people in the West.

In the grand scheme of worldly matters, this bill is such a small speck on the globe that it hardly exists. But in terms of problems that might very well face the people involved here, it is a life-or-death circumstance. We have small landholders, many of whom have used the water they currently are using for some 20 years, who suddenly will find themselves with the tap proverbially cut off.

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] I particularly want to express my appreciation for the gentleman's cooperation in this matter. It is unusual in this House for us to really express clearly that we do care about folks, and you have cared today, George, and I appreciate it. My friend from Colorado always cares, but the gentleman from California and I have to talk to each other now and then.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman has clearly outlined that which this bill is about and in detail has explained what we are attempting to accomplish. Those people who are involved in noncontract water use need some help. In the final analysis, the bill will not cost the taxpayers any money.

What it will do is respond particularly to the needs of the citizens of Needles, CA, a small community in my district which is in California some 3 or 4 hours away from the nearest sizable town. It is an effort to make sure that those people who have been legitimately using water, and clearly understood they will have a supply available, will continue to have that supply.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the House responding in the same positive fashion the committee has by passing this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for his help in bringing this bill to the floor. The gentleman is quite right, this is not something we woke up every morning thinking about. But without the gentleman's persistence and without the gentleman's cooperation, it simply would not have arrived here on the House floor under the rules of suspension. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for all of that cooperation, and hope that others recognize the role the gentleman played.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5028, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5028, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## RETIREMENT CREDIT TO NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3006, to correct certain inequities by providing Federal civil service credit for retirement purposes and for the purpose of computing length of

service to determine entitlement to leave, compensation, life insurance, health benefits, severance pay, tenure, and status in the case of certain individuals who performed service as National Guard technicans before January 1, 1969, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3006

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) a period of service performed under section 709 of title 32, United States Code, or under a prior corresponding provision of law, before January 1, 1969, which would not otherwise be creditable under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, because of the next to last sentence of section 8332(b) of such title 5, shall be considered creditable service under such subchapter, notwithstanding such next to last sentence, in the case of any individual under subsection (b).

(b) Subsection (a) applies in the case of any individual who—

(1) before the end of the 14-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, files appropriate written application with the Office of Personnel Management in accordance with regulations under subsection (c);

(2) at the time of filing application under paragraph (1), is employed by the Government and is subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code (other than under section 8344 of such title); and

(3) before the date of the separation on which entitlement to an annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is based, makes an appropriate deposit under section 8334(c) of such title with respect to the period of service involved, based on the percentage of basic pay for such service which would be required under such section if such service had been performed as an employee under such subchapter.

(c) The Office of Personnel Management shall, not later than 2 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, prescribe regulations to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3006, legislation introduced by Congressman G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, to provide civil service retirement credit for technicians who left the National Guard prior to January 1, 1969.

This amended legislation was unanimously reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 11, by a vote of 20 to 0. Earlier, the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, which I chair, approved my amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 3006 by a unanimous voice vote.

I would like to commend my colleagues on the committee and the subcommittee, especially Chairman FORD and Congressmen JOHN MYERS and DON YOUNG, the minority members of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, for their assistance and support in moving H.R. 3006. I also want to express my appreciation to Chairman MONTGOMERY for his leadership and commitment to equitable treatment for former National Guard technicians.

In 1968, Congress adopted the National Guard Technician Act which allowed technicians who served at least 1 day on or after January 1, 1969, to receive credit under the civil service retirement system. Former technicians who left the National Guard prior to this date did not receive any civil service retirement credit for their years of service. In effect, under current law, former technicians could receive full retirement credit if, in fact, they were reemployed by the National Guard as a technician for only 1 day.

Under these circumstances, it seems reasonable and appropriate that we permit such former technicians to receive credit under the civil service retirement system. The amended bill insures that former technicians who left the National Guard before January 1, 1969, would receive credit under the civil service retirement system for their years of service under the following circumstances:

First, before the end of a 14-month period beginning on the date of enactment, the former technician files a written application with the Office of Personnal Management;

Second, at the time of filing such an application, the individual is employed by the Government and is eligible for civil service retirement; and

Third, before the date of separation, the individual makes a desposit to the civil service retirement fund for the period of service which will be credited. The deposit will be based on the percentage of basic pay which the former technician would have been required to contribute into the civil service retirement system.

Mr. Speaker, the former National Guard technicians who would be affected by H.R. 3006 have been arbitrarily denied retirement credit for their pre-1969 service. National Guard technicians have contributed greatly to this Nation's security. The performance of such work before or after a given date does not diminish its value. In fairness, all such service should be treated equally for purposes of granting civil service retirement credit. H.R. 3006, as amended, offers an equitable solution to the disparate treatment of National Guard technicians under the retirement program.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that H.R. 3006, as amended, will provide these former technicians with the retirement credit they deserve and, at the same time, will facilitate the administration of this program by the Office of Personnel Management. I am very pleased that the bill has been endorsed by the American Legion and other veterans organizations. In addition, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this legislation will have minimal costs. I urge my colleagues' support for H.R. 3006.

EXPLANATION OF H.R. 3006, as Reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3006, as ordered reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is to authorize civil service retirement credit for certain individuals who performed service as National Guard technicians before January 1, 1969.

COMMITTEE ACTION

On July 16, 1985, Mr. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY introduced H.R. 3006, a bill to provide Federal civil service credit for retirement purposes in the case of certain individuals who performed service as National Guard technicians before January 1, 1969, and for other purposes. The bill referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

On March 12, 1986, the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits held a hearing on H.R. 3006. Testimony was received from Members of Congress, representatives of the Administration, and other public witnesses.

On May 8, 1986, the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits unanimously approved H.R. 3006 with an amendment striking all after the enacting clause and inserting a substitute text, offered by Ms. OAKAR. On June 11, 1986, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, by a record vote of 20 to 0 and with a quorum present, ordered H.R. 3006 favorably reported with the substitute text and an amendment to the title of the bill.

STATEMENT

Twenty years ago, service as a National Guard technican was not considered creditable for civil service retirement purposes. In 1968, however, Congress passed the National Guard Technicians Act, enabling thousands of technicians serving across the nation to be covered by civil service retirement. Individuals employed as National Guard technicians on or after January 1, 1969, received retirement credit for all of their service as technicians. However, individuals who left the Guard before that date and who were employed in other Federal agencies were denied retirement credit for their pre-1969 technician service. If these individuals were reemployed by the National Guard as technicians for only one day after January 1, 1969 and before their retirement, they could receive credit for their pre-1969 technician service.

National Guard technicians have contributed greatly to this nation's security. The performance of such work, whether before or after January 1, 1969, is of equal value to this country. Consequently, the committee believes that all such service should be treated equally for purposes of civil service retirement credit.

SECTION ANALYSIS

Subsection (a) provides that service performed as a National Guard technician before January 1, 1969, which would not otherwise be creditable for civil service retirement purposes because the individual performing such service had left the Guard prior to 1969, shall be considered creditable service under the civil service retirement system if the individual satisfies the criteria specified in subsection (b).

Subsection (b)(1) provides that such an individual must file appropriate written application with the Office of Personnel Management before the end of the 14-month period beginning on the date of enactment of the Act.

Subsection (b)(2) provides that the individual must be employed by the Government and must be subject to the civil service retirement system other than as a reemployed annuitant.

On March 12, 1986, the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits held a hearing on H.R. 3006. Witnesses at this hearing testified that the 1968 National Guard Technicians Act arbitrarily denied CSRS credit for pre-1969 service by former National Guard technicians. At the same time, the Act granted CSRS credit for pre-1969 service by individuals who were employed as technicians on or after January 1, 1969.

During the hearing, concerns were expressed that extending civil service retirement credit for past, non-covered service might impose a financial burden on the CSRS. Consequently, the committee inquired into the possible costs of extending CSRS credit to former National Guard technicians. Witnesses at the hearing estimated that today there are fewer than 500 Federal employees who served as National Guard technicians and left the guard before 1969. According to these witnesses, these individuals would be willing to deposit into the civil service retirement fund an amount equal to what their retirement contributions would have been at the time of their employment as technicians had they then been covered under the CSRS. The committee, therefore, is convinced that the cost of correcting the inequity in treatment of former National Guard technicians would be minimal.

The committee believes that the former National Guard technicians who would be affected by this legislation have been arbitrarily denied retirement credit for their pre-1969 service.

Subsection (b)(3) provides that the individual must, before the date of separation from Federal service covered by CSRS, make an appropriate deposit to the civil service retirement fund with respect to the service as a National Guard technician. The deposit must be equal to the percentage of basic pay for such service which would have been required had such service been performed as an employee under the CSRS.

Subsection (c) requires the Office of Personnel Management, not later than 2 months after the date of enactment, to prescribe regulations to carry out the Act.

CBO COST ESTIMATE

The cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office is set forth below:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
*Washington, DC, June 20, 1986.*

Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 3006 as ordered reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 11, 1986. If enacted, this bill would allow certain federal employees to count their service prior to January, 1969 as National Guard technicians toward Civil Service Retirement (CSR) benefits. Under current law, this service is not creditable unless the individual was employed as a National Guard technician on January 1, 1969 or thereafter.

Based on information provided during the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits hearing, it appears that some 300 current federal employees would be eligible to receive service credit for approximately 7.5 years of pre-1969 service. In order to qualify for these benefits, the individuals must apply for credit within a specified time frame, and must deposit in the CSR fund an amount equal to what would have been withheld from salary if the service had originally been creditable plus interest equal to three percent per year. The cost estimate assumes that approximately three-fourths of those individuals affected by this bill would retire during 1986 through 1991. It also assumes deposits would be made immediately before retirement.

Over the six-year period 1986–1991, H.R. 3006 would increase the federal deficit by an estimated $1.9 million, beginning in 1986 with a $0.1 million reduction and ending in 1991 with a $0.9 million increase. The following estimates show the increase in CSR outlays due to higher benefit payments and the increase in revenues from lump-sum deposits that would occur if H.R. 3006 were enacted.

[In millions of dollars]

| | Estimated outlays | Estimated revenues | Net budgetary impact |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year: | | | |
| 1986 | ([1]) | 0.1 | −0.1 |
| 1987 | .2 | .3 | −.1 |
| 1988 | .4 | .2 | +.2 |
| 1989 | .6 | .2 | +.4 |
| 1990 | .9 | .2 | +.6 |
| 1991 | 1.1 | .2 | +.9 |

[1] Estimated at less then $0.05 million.

Note.—Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details on this estimate.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER,
*Director.*

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3006, reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on a 20-to-0 vote, would allow certain Federal employees to count their service prior to January, 1969, as National Guard technicians toward their civil service retirement benefits. Congress, in 1968, enacted legislation granting Federal Civil Service credit to thousands of technicians working for National Guard units around the country, but arbitrarily limited coverage to those technicians who serviced in that capacity for at least 1 day on or after January 1, 1969.

Based on information received by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits only about 300 current Federal employees would be eligible to receive service credit for approximately 7.5 years of pre-1969 service. To qualify, the individual would have to apply for credit within a specified time frame, and at the time of filing be employed by the Government and subject to the Civil Service Retirement System. Additionally, the individual would have to make a deposit to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the period of service to be credited.

The National Guard Technicians Act of 1968, not only penalized certain former National Guard technicians but ignored their important contributions as behind-the-scenes support personnel who keep the National Guard ready for State and Federal assignments.

Passage of this bill will remove an arbitrary exclusion that 18 years ago denied well deserved credit under the Civil Service Retirement System for a small group of technicians.

□ 1440

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the author of this bill, a real champion for people in the National Guard and indeed all people who are associated with the military.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio Ms. MARY ROSE OAKAR, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the ranking minority member of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], who is handling the bill today, for their total support. The vote, I am told, was 20 to 0. I want to express my thanks to the entire committee. I appreciate the cooperation and courtesy they showed me in helping bring this bill to the House for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I introduced the bill we are debating today in order to correct an inequity for certain individuals who served as National Guard technicians prior to January 1, 1969.

Before 1969, there was confusion and disagreement concerning the employment status of technicians. In 1969, Congress attempted to clear up

the situation by passing legislation to bring the technicians into the Federal Civil Service System. Under the law, however, only those who served as technicians on or after January 1, 1969, are allowed Federal Civil Service credit for service performed prior to that date.

My bill will correct this obvious inequity by allowing credit for all prior technician service.

I, like my colleagues, am concerned about the Federal deficit. I do believe, however, that the cost of the proposal will be insignificant since there are less than 400 potential claimants.

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues for their support in approving H.R. 3006.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS].

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 3006, legislation broadening the National Guard technician retirement credit.

Under the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968, National Guard technicians who served after January 1, 1969, were given Civil Service retirement credit for the time they served as National Guard technicians. The legislation before us today would allow former National Guard technicians to receive Civil Service retirement credit for their service prior to 1969.

In order to qualify the bill outlines several criteria that former technicians must meet. These include filing a written application within 14 months of enactment, being currently employed by the Federal Government and covered under the Civil Service Retirement System and, before retiring, deposit into the Civil Service Retirement System the amount they would have contributed for the credited service. According to the committee, fewer than 500 former technicians who left the National Guard prior to 1969 now work in Federal agencies and receive no Civil Service credit for their earlier service. While the number of people affected by this legislation is small, for these individuals this is no small matter.

There are some very significant, inequities remedied by this bill, and I deeply appreciate the efforts of the committee in taking care of these individuals. I urge my colleagues to vote "yea" on the passage of H.R. 3006.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3006, legislation to amend title V, United States Code, to correct certain inequities by providing Federal Civil Service retirement credit to certain individuals who performed service as National Guard technicians before January 1, 1986.

Before 1969 there was confusion and disagreement as to the employment status of technicians. Their salary was actually paid by the Federal Government, most of the conditions of employment were set out in rules of the Federal National Guard Bureau, and the courts had held that they were Federal employees for certain purposes. However, the Federal Government continued to maintain that technicians were State employees, and some of the States insisted that they were Federal employees.

In 1968 Congress acted to clear up the situation by passing legislation to bring the technicians into the Federal Civil Service Retirement System. However, the legislation which Congress enacted only gave credit for past technicians service to those who were employed as technicians on or after the effective date of the legislation—January 1, 1969.

Those technicians who had moved to other Federal jobs, or who had left their technician jobs before that date and who were later employed by other Federal agencies, were given no credit for their past technician service.

Accordingly, we must rectify this inequity and pass H.R. 3006 and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3006, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

A bill to correct certain inequities by providing Federal civil service credit for retirement purposes in the case of certain individuals who performed service as National Guard technicians before January 1, 1969.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter on H.R. 3006, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR 1987

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4060) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the full cost-of-living adjustment in annuities payable from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund shall be made for 1987, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4060

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

SECTION 1. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 8352. Benefits during calendar year 1987

"(a) Any benefits payable from the fund during calendar year 1987, including any increase in those benefits which is scheduled to become payable during such calendar year as the result of an adjustment under section 8340 of this title, shall not be subject to reduction or suspension, either pursuant to statute (other than applicable provisions of this chapter) or Presidential order, during such calendar year.

"(b) For the purpose of this section, 'benefits payable from the Fund' shall be determined solely in accordance with applicable provisions of this chapter.".

(b) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 8351 the following:

"8352. Benefits during calendar year 1987.".

SEC. 2. MILITARY RETIREMENT AND SURVIVOR BENEFIT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any percentage adjustment provided by law to be made in amounts payable under military retirement and survivor benefit programs to take effect during fiscal year 1987 shall take effect in accordance with the law providing for such adjustment.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—During fiscal year 1987, an adjustment described in subsection (a) shall not be subject to reduction or suspension under any provision of law (other than applicable provisions of title 10, United States Code) or any Presidential order.

(c) MILITARY RETIREMENT AND SURVIVOR BENEFIT PROGRAMS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "military retirement and survivor benefit programs" means—

(A) the provisions of law creating entitlement to, or determining the amount of, retired or retainer pay for members of the uniformed services; and

(B) the programs providing annuities for survivors of members and former members of the uniformed services, including chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, section 4 of Public Law 92-425, and section 5 of Public Law 96-402.

(2) The term "uniformed services" has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

SEC. 3. FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1987.

Section 826 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4066) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(h)(1) Any benefits payable from the Fund during calendar year 1987, including any increase in those benefits which is scheduled to become payable during such calendar year pursuant to subsection (a), shall not be subject to reduction or suspension, either pursuant to statute (other than applicable provisions of this subchapter) or Presidential order, during such calendar year.

"(2) For the purpose of this subsection, 'benefits payable from the Fund' shall be determined solely in accordance with applicable provisions of this subchapter.".

SEC. 4. BENEFITS UNDER THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM.

The President shall, pursuant to the authority granted in section 292 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees (50 U.S.C. 403 note), extend the prohibition contained in section 8352 of title 5, United States Code, on reduction or suspension of certain benefits payable from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, to apply with respect to benefits payable from the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund.

SEC. 5. RAILROAD RETIREMENT TIER II COLAS.

Section 3(g)(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231b(g)(1)) is amended by inserting ", shall not otherwise be prevented from taking effect, with respect to benefits paid during calendar year 1987, by any provision of law other than this Act," after "shall not be deferred".

SEC. 6. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE DISABILITY COMPENSATION DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1987.

Section 8147 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d)(1) Any compensation payable from the Fund during calendar year 1987, including any increase in those benefits which is scheduled to become payable during such calendar year pursuant to section 8146a, shall not be subject to reduction or suspension, either pursuant to statute (other than applicable provisions of this subchapter) or Presidential order, during such calendar year.

"(2) For the purpose of this subsection, 'compensation payable from the Fund' shall be determined solely in accordance with applicable provisions of this subchapter.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to give favorable consideration to H.R. 4060, legislation I introduced earlier this year to guarantee a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] to civil service annuitants in January 1987.

This bill was reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on June 11, by unanimous voice vote. It was also approved by unanimous voice vote by my Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits on May 8.

The bill, as it has been brought to the House floor today, includes an amendment to ensure that military, tier II Railroad Retirement, CIA, Foreign Service, and certain FECA beneficiaries are guaranteed their 1987 COLA as well. I am sponsoring this amendment because the recipients of these retirement benefits were denied a 1986 cost-of-living adjustment in their annuities in the same manner as civil service retirees.

I believe the amendment is a necessary addition to the legislation to ensure equal treatment among our Nation's retirees. It has been approved by the chairman of each of the committees which has jurisdiction over these programs. As I am certain many of you know, Federal annuitants, along with military, Foreign Service, CIA, railroad, and some Federal disability retirees, were denied their January 1986 COLA's as a result of the enactment of the Gramm-Rudman legislation. If Gramm-Rudman were to continue for the next 5 years, these annuitants may not receive another COLA increase until 1991.

Federal budget cuts during the last 6 years have already fallen heavily on Federal workers and annuitants. Annuitants have lost approximately 30 percent of their cost-of-living adjustments. Such reductions fall especially hard on Federal retirees whose average pensions are less than $12,000 a year and survivors of Federal workers whose average benefit is less than $6,000.

We cannot undo the events of the past. However, we can prevent the perpetuation of inequitable treatment of those senior citizens who performed the jobs so essential to making our Government work. We can achieve this goal by adopting H.R. 4060.

We should not forget that these are the people who defended our country through three wars, built the railroads that span our Nation, served in our Embassies across the world and protected our country from foreign aggression, sent Americans into space, and administered the myriad of social programs that assist the men and women of this great Nation.

I am gratified and pleased that more than 280 of our colleagues in the House have cosponsored this legislation. Their support has been essential in moving this bill. It is also important to note that more than two-thirds of this body has endorsed this bill, reaffirming their desire to keep faith with our Nation's retirees and to treat them fairly.

Finally, I want to point out that the Congressional Budget Office has determined that H.R. 4060 will not impact on the fiscal year 1987 budget in any way. I also would like to mention that the budget resolution, recently approved by the House, reflects the basic principle of H.R. 4060.

H.R. 4060 is the vehicle to ensure fairness and equity in the retirement community. I encourage all my colleagues to vote favorably for this bill.

I am including for the RECORD a letter from Albert H. Linden, Jr., National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
*Washington, DC, June 24, 1986.*

Hon. MARY ROSE OAKAR,
*U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OAKAR: This letter is in reference to H.R. 4060, a bill that you introduced in the House of Representatives which, among other things, purposes that the cost of living adjustments (COLAs) of all military retirees—including those who are retired by reason of service-connected disability—shall be received in Fiscal Year 1987, notwithstanding any sequestration order that may be issued under Public Law 99-177, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Representative Oakar, on behalf of the over one million members of the Disabled American Veterans and its Ladies' Auxiliary, I wish to express to you our organization's deepest appreciation for your sponsorship of this most important legislation.

As you are well aware, as a result of the ongoing Fiscal Year 1986 sequestration order issued relative to P.L. 99-177, thousands of military retirees—including the above cited category of those who have incurred a service-related disability—were forced to forego the cost of living adjustment in their benefits that was to have gone into effect on January 1, 1986.

In view of the "Gramm/Rudman/Hollings" exemptions that have already been provided to certain categories of federal beneficiaries, the DAV does not believe that Congress envisioned or intended the reasonable adjustment of military retirement pay to be sacrificed in a "blind" pursuit of a balanced budget.

Quite obviously, you are of this same opinion.

In closing, Representative Oakar, I again want to thank you very much for your advocacy on behalf of our nation's service-connected disabled veterans. We in the DAV urge your colleagues in the House to give you their full and unqualified support for passage of H.R. 4060.

Sincerely,

ALBERT H. LINDEN, Jr.,
*National Commander.*

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I can say without fear of contradiction that this is fair play legislation. Basically, H.R. 4060 provides equal treatment for various categories of Federal annuities with respect to cost-of-living adjustments.

Specifically, the bill, in its original form prohibits the reduction or suspension by Presidential order or statute of any cost-of-living adjustment payable to civil service retirees during calendar year 1987. Under the amendment similar treatment will be extended to recipients of military, Foreign Service, Central Intelligence Agency, disability and tier II Railroad Retirement benefits.

Under Gramm-Rudman, if deficit targets are not met, certain COLA's are suspended. As a result, civil service, military, railroad and disability annuitants received no COLA in 1986.

The fact that the original bill had nearly 290 cosponsors is evidence of the widespread belief in this body that Federal annuitants already have been asked to shoulder a disproportionate share of the load resulting from the deficit crisis.

We are not breaking any new ground here today. What we are doing is making good on a promise to our retirees and our current workers, by standing by our commitments we are telling the current work force that their golden years will be protected against inflation.

The average pension is about $12,000 a year while survivor benefits average about $6,000. You can see how important a small, but anticipated COLA is in family budgeting.

It is worth pointing out that the Senate and House budget resolutions provide for cost-of-living increases. Additionally the Congressional Budget Office baseline civil service retirement trust fund already includes a 3.4-percent estimated COLA increase to be paid to civilian retirees during calendar year 1987.

As I see it, COLA probably is the single most important concern of retirees. In supporting this bill, we are telling all of our workers, current and retired, that we do, indeed, have a quality retirement system.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the ranking majority member of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], who authored this bill and who has worked hard for its passage and who has contacted practically every Member of this body and has received the support and cosponsorship of nearly 300 Members. I think the gentlewoman is due a great deal of credit for her untiring efforts on behalf of our retired Federal employees and present Federal employees. I would like to express my appreciation for her efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060 which would guarantee Federal retirees a full cost-of-living adjustment in January 1987. As a cosponsor, I fully support this legislation. I am pleased this bill has been amended to grant the full fiscal year 1987 COLA to railroad, Foreign Service, military, and other Government retirees as well.

Balancing the Federal budget and reducing the national debt are the most important matters facing this Congress. Deficit reduction efforts must be fair, however, and I do not believe that the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation, which eliminated the January 1986 COLA, passed the fairness test.

My congressional district has one of the largest concentration of Federal retirees of any district in the country. Earlier this year, I heard from hundreds of concerned retirees who have said that they had counted on receiving their COLA and would have difficulty making ends meet without an inflation adjustment. Most of these retirees live on fixed budgets and denying the COLA for this group of Americans seriously hampers their ability to maintain or sustain current protection against inflation.

It is important to recognize that these retired Americans are individuals who dedicated their lives to public service—to making our Nation a better place for all its citizens. It is unfair to single them out to accept cuts that others are not asked to accept.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has bipartisan support and is supported by the National Association of Retired Federal Employees. It is, I believe, a good piece of legislation which will correct a very inequitable situation and I fully support its speedy passage.

□ 1455

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the comments that my colleague made about the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR]. Had she not persisted and pushed and pulled and done everything that she possibly could, this legislation would not be on the floor. I think all of us owe her a debt of gratitude, as well as all of the retirees in this Nation, for her persistence in passing this legislation today.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4060, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which will ensure that the cost-of-living adjustment scheduled during 1987 will be paid to Federal retirees. This is just one step in ending the inequitable treatment of COLA's for Federal retirees under current law. As the committee report states, "The decision to differentiate between annuitants with respect to COLA's was contrary to a policy decision made by the Congress in the first session of the 99th Congress during budget deliberations." This is true and both parties, Democrat and Republican, demonstrated in their budget alternatives that it was possible to have Gramm-Rudman and still pay COLA's on an equitable basis.

This legislation is not a panacea. Discrimination still exists under law. This week I will introduce legislation designed to end that discrimination permanently. My legislation will guarantee that all Federal retirees and Social Security recipients receive the same COLA each and every year. This legislation will not change the Social Security law, but will simply grant all Federal retirees the same COLA. This will include a permanent exemption from the provisions of Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently stood for equitable treatment of all our Nation's retirees. I urge my colleagues to join me in making permanent a policy of equity toward all retirees by joining as cosponsors of my legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060, legislation to amend title V, United States Code, to provide that the full cost-of-living annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund shall be made for 1987 and I commend the gentlelady from Ohio for her leadership on this issue.

Since 1981, Federal retirees have not received a full COLA even though rising inflation continues to erode their retirement income. Unlike active employees, these retirees depend upon a fixed income which they are hard-pressed to supplement so late in life. By freezing or limiting the only inflation adjustment available to these older men and women, the Congress would be reducing their pensions by reducing their buying power.

During the past 5 years, we have seen Congress eliminate the biannual COLA and delay the payment date by linking it to Social Security. This linkage, Congress stated, would protect civil service COLA's from future attack. However, Congress last year singled out Federal retiree COLA's from Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts while protecting the Social Security COLA. Civilian retirees understand the need for deficit reduction, nevertheless they cannot understand why they continue to be singled out; especially when their Social Security counterparts are protected. Accordingly, I feel that Federal retirees should receive the full civil service retirement COLA each year. And I urge my collagues to fully support H.R. 4060.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 4060 and commend the author and the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their work in this area.

I am also pleased by the inclusion of the provisions of H.R. 4671, a bill providing COLA's for military retirees, and H.R. 4338, a bill to provide COLA's for tier II Federal retirees. I cosponsored all three of these important bills which guarantee equality and fairness in the treatment of retirees.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue of fairness, plain and simple. The question before us is whether or not we believe

that the Federal Government should discriminate against certain Federal retirees, namely military, railroad, and civil service. I hope that the answer will be a resounding no.

Back in 1983, we asked Social Security retirees to forgo a COLA in order to help place the system on a sound financial footing. We have asked civil service and military retirees to make similar sacrifices in 1985 and 1986. I believe civil service, military, and railroad retirees have contributed more than enough to efforts to reduce the national deficit. This bill will insure that these retirees will not be asked once again to forgo their much-deserved COLA's in 1987.

Again, I commend the committee for bringing this bill to the floor and urge all Members to support it.

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to my colleague from California [Mr. FAZIO], who has been very instrumental in seeking to protect the COLA for military retirees and I am very proud to have been a cosponsor of this legislation which would have guaranteed the January 1987 COLA for men and women in our Armed Forces.

I believe, even though our committee did not have jurisdiction, that they were discriminated against as well. I know the Speaker is a retiree himself and I know he looks with pride on the work that we are trying to do here today.

I also want to include for the RECORD at this point a letter from Chairman LES ASPIN, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in support of the expansion of H.R. 4060 to include the same COLA protection for military retirees. I want to thank him personally for that.

The letter follows:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
*Washington, DC, January 12, 1986.*

Hon. MARY ROSE OAKAR,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MARY ROSE: I understand that H.R. 4060, your bill to fortify the civil service retirement COLA against the effects of a sequester under Gramm-Rudman in 1987, has been approved both by your Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits and by the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I am sure you have considered whether military retirees ought to receive the same treatment as civil service retirees on this issue. As you know, the bill in its current form would not appear to protect military COLAs. It would only protect payments from the civil service retirement fund. Even though military retirement COLAs are based on the timing and amount of civil service retirement COLAs, military retirees are not paid from the civil service retirement fund.

I recognize that the scope of the bill has been confined to the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I would hope, however, that you might be willing to broaden the scope of the bill to achieve equity between military and civil service retirees. Extending the benefit of the bill to military retirees would certainly have my support. Obviously, the Committee on Armed Services would do nothing to cause a sequential referral of such a broadened bill. Indeed, I would hope that such a change could be accommodated in your plan to bring the bill to the floor under suspension of the rules.

I would be very interested to know your thinking on this matter, so that the Committee on Armed Services might consider how to proceed. I am sending a similar letter to Chairman Ford.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
*Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4060, I rise in strong support of the gentlewoman from Ohio's bill, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this measure.

Over the past 3 years, inflation has risen 10.1 percent. Social Security recipients have received a full COLA for each of these 3 years—1984, 3.5 percent; 1985, 3.5 percent; 1986, 3.1 percent. Military and Federal retirees however, have only received one COLA increase during that same period—1984, 3.1 percent.

To add insult to injury, the 3.1 percent COLA that was due in January 1986 fell victim to the Gramm-Rudman sequestration. And, as you know, under the terms of that legislation, COLA's for Federal and military retirees could be denied for 5 full years. Those who voted for Gramm-Rudman, in effect, sacrificed our retirees.

The enormous deficits that we are grappling with require sacrifices. But the program reductions that are necessary should not be imposed by taking aim at one group and inflicting inequitable and continuous harm.

Congresswoman OAKAR's legislation is a way to limit the damage imposed by Gramm-Rudman. If sequestration is required, all COLA's, except those received by Social Security recipients, will be the first to be eliminated. H.R. 4060 will prevent that for the coming fiscal year.

Representative OAKAR is one of Congress' most ardent supporters of the rights of Federal employees and retirees. She has championed numerous programs and policies throughout her years in Congress in order to ensure a top notch Federal workforce and a consistent and reliable benefit and retirement program for our Government employees. H.R. 4060 is in keeping with her efforts over the past years.

Also in keeping with Ms. OAKAR's philosophy of equitable treatment for all, she has agreed to incorporate the provisions of H.R. 4671, a measure I introduced as a companion to H.R. 4060. My bill provides a COLA in fiscal year 1987 for military, Coast Guard, NOAA, and Public Health Service retirees. Further, when Ms. OAKAR moves to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4060, she will provide coverage for tier II railroad retirees, CIA, and Foreign Service retirees.

I hope that you vote in favor of this bill that helps to address the existing inequity. Military and Federal retirees should not be charged with a disproportionate share of deficit reduction. These citizens who devoted their careers to serving this Nation must not be singled out for particularly harsh treatment.

Again, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio for her leadership on this issue and her long term and continuous work on behalf of our Federal workers and retirees and now the many others who depend on us to keep our commitment to a decent retirement.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to publicly thank the chairman of the Committee on energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for allowing us to offer this amendment to incorporate railroad retirees, and I am very pleased to have as one of the supporters and someone who would like to share his thoughts with us, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, a real champion for railroad workers and railroad retirees, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FLORIO].

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FLORIO].

Mr. FLORIO. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation. This bill will ensure that normal cost-of-living adjustments will be paid in 1987 under several important retirement systems, including Civil Service Retirement, Military Retirement, and Railroad Retirement.

I am particularly pleased that the pending legislation, in section 5, guarantees the tier II cost-of-living adjustment for railroad retirees that is payable in 1987. This section is based on section 2 of H.R. 4338, the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Benefits Protection Act of 1986, which I introduced. That legislation, H.R. 4338, provides comprehensive protection to railroad retirement and unemployment insurance benefits from the effects of Gramm-Rudman and has already been approved by the subcommittee I chair.

Railroad retirees have sacrificed greatly in recent years to keep their retirement system solvent. These sacrifices, painful as they have been, have worked. The system is now healthy

and capable of paying full benefits. Yet, in the name of Gramm-Rudman, railroad retirees have been asked to sacrifice yet again and give up additional earned benefits.

In particular, the Gramm-Rudman law eliminated the January 1986 cost-of-living adjustments for tier II benefits. This COLA elimination does not make any sense, since these railroad retirement benefits are paid from a self-contained trust fund which is currently financially healthy. The money "saved" by eliminating COLA under Gramm-Rudman remains in the trust fund and thus does not reduce the deficit in any real sense.

Fortunately, this bill will ensure that railroad retirees will receive their normal tier II cost-of-living adjustment payable beginning in January 1987. (The tier I cost-of-living adjustment, along with the basic tier II benefits, are currently protected from any cutback under Gramm-Rudman.)

I want to acknowledge the assistance of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], the chairwoman of the Compensation and Employee Benefits Subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for their cooperation in including this protection for railroad retirees in H.R. 4060.

I urge support of the bill.

□ 1505

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

Mr. Speaker, in order to allow people who are covered under FECA to get a COLA as well, we had to have the cooperation of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAWKINS], whom I would like to acknowledge, and also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AUSTIN MURPHY] for their fine cooperation.

I would also like to acknowledge the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, Mr. DAN MICA, for their cooperation so that Foreign Service retirees could get their cost-of-living adjustment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my friend and colleague, a great champion of Federal workers and retirees and others, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA].

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong suport of H.R. 4060, introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], the subcommittee chairman, and I also rise to commend her, the ranking member, and the committee members for bringing in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong support of H.R. 4060, introduced by my colleague from Ohio, which will guarantee the January 1987 cost-of-living adjustment to civil service annuitants.

The President's requests for Federal personnel and annuitants, in his budget proposals for fiscal year 1987, fall under the heading, "Make Federal government services more efficient, effective and accountable." Among those requests, we find a 3-percent pay increase almost completely effaced by a 2-percent increase in employee contribution to the civil service retirement system, a COLA freeze for fiscal year 1987, and a restriction on future COLA's to 2 percent under inflation. We are to assume, then, that our Government will better function with a disenchanted and diminishing work force, for such will be the result if the administration has its way.

During the last 5 fiscal years, Federal employees have seen their pay capped, frozen, deferred, threatened and actually reduced in real terms. For the period 1981 through 1985, Federal white-collar pay increased 16.3 percent, while the Consumer Price Index increased 27.6 percent, and private sector pay increased 27.5 percent. In 1985 the President's "Pay Agent" (that is, the directors of OPM, OMB, and the Secretary of Labor) found that Federal white-collar pay, on average, lagged 19.15 percent behind the private sector.

Furthermore, since 1976 the value of Federal pensions has been cut by 10 percent. Contrary to the widespread myth that the Federal retirement system is the Nation's most generous retirement program, recent studies reviewing retirement benefits paid in the private sector have demonstrated that many private pension programs replace a greater portion of an employee's preretirement income than Federal plans do. In addition, Federal employees contribute 7 percent of their salaries to their retirement. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has reported that in 1982, 93 percent of the pension programs included in their survey of medium and large firms do not require any employee contribution.

The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act mandated COLA freezes across the board, with the exception of social security, for 1986. Despite the grim statistics, and on top of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, the Reagan administration is intent upon more cuts. The administration's proposal for a 3 percent pay increase for fiscal year 1987 will be almost completely offset by the proposed increase, from 7 percent to 9 percent, in the employee contribution to the Federal retirement system. The administration also proposes to cap Federal pay increases at 3 percent for fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year 1989.

Coupled with these inequitable provisions for Federal civil workers is the President's recommendation for the elimination of the January 1987 COLA. When COLA's resume in 1988, he proposes to pay them at a rate of 2 percent under inflation.

These proposals—the 2-percent increase in employee contribution, the COLA freeze, restricting future COLA's to 2 percent under inflation—must be defeated. These proposals threaten to create serious morale, recruitment, and retention problems within the Federal workforce. The professionalism of the Federal workforce is an ever-growing phenomenon. It has become one of the finest educated and highly trained corps of individuals ever assembled. During the last 20 years, the number of scientists, engineers, and physicians employed by the Government has increased 50 percent, while the number of lawyers has doubled. We run a risk in destroying the morale of this competent, dedicated, and professional workforce. We run the risk of losing the best and the brightest.

This bill sends a strong signal to our civil service retirees of our commitment to preserve a reliable and fair retirement benefit. H.R. 4060, of which I am a cosponsor, promises to grant Federal retirees their 1987 COLA. In addition, it pleases me that military retirees will also have their 1987 COLA's protected under this bill. I firmly believe that passage of this bill will endure a reasonable level of benefit for retirees who have contributed inestimably to public and military service.

I hope I can count on the support of my colleagues in the passage of H.R. 4060. The administration has lashed out most unfairly at our Federal workforce; it is imperative that Congress stand firm in their behalf.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to a champion of retirees who did a good job in trying to help them with respect to housing several days ago so that they would not have their housing rents increased, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. I thank my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060, and take this opportunity to commend Ms. OAKAR and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR]. Mr. Speaker, as usual, Ms. OAKAR is leading the parade when it comes to helping our Federal workers and our retirees, and I want to have my voice added to the more than two-thirds of the Members of this body who cospon-

sored this important legislation allowing cost of living increases starting next January 1 for our retired Federal workers and railroad retirees.

If I could just take a few seconds to capsulize the need for this, I ran into a retired worker out in Illinois after just having received a 10-percent increase in his utility bills who said, "When are you going to pass that COLA bill, Mr. GRAY?" He said, "I don't need the money, it's the people I owe that need it."

I think you can see that by Congress giving increases to those on Social Security and other people who are living on fixed incomes and to deny the Federal worker, we are placing them in a very tough spot economically. This bill will correct that, and I want to rise to congratulate Ms. OAKAR, Mr. TAYLOR, and the other members of the committee and to say I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this important bill. Thank you.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this moment to thank my colleagues for their kind words about our efforts, and I want to congratulate my full committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for permitting me to expeditiously get the bill through the committee. I want to thank the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], the minority member on my subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], who was so cooperative, and indeed, all members of the full committee, for their mutual cooperation on this bill, and all the other committees interrelated with this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we are not in any way, shape, or form trying to pit Social Security recipients against other recipients. As a matter of fact, I personally believe that Social Security recipients should get a cost-of-living adjustment, and have always supported that. But I also think that Federal annuitants, military retirees, Foreign Service retirees, CIA retirees, railroad retirees, and other Federal disability retirees who were denied a COLA should get a COLA in 1987. It really is not fair to them, especially people who have given so much of their youth to make our country the greatest country in the world.

I hope that no Member votes against this legislation, and I hope that we can in the future not discriminate against older Americans who really deserves this cost-of-living adjustment and who have given so much to our country.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4060 I rise in strong support of this legislation. I especially want to thank Congresswoman OAKAR for her hard work to insure that our Federal and military retirees receive a cost-of-living allowance [COLA] in 1987.

I have received numerous letters and calls in recent months from Federal and military retirees in my district. Their message to me has been this: "We are as willing as any group in the country to make the sacrifices necessary to cut our Federal deficit, but only if others are willing to make equal sacrifices." They know, as I do, that our economy will never experience a full recovery until we shrink the Federal sea of red ink. But Federal retirees, along with military retirees and others, have been asked to sacrifice over and over again in recent years, while other parts of the Federal budget have been spared.

Many of the retirees who contacted me expressed support for an across-the-board freeze in Federal spending. They realize this would be a good way to reduce our deficits and insure that the necessary sacrifices are shared. I agree with them. However, what we've seen is a tendency to freeze the COLA's of our Federal and military retirees, without requiring others to share in this sacrifice.

This bill, H.R. 4060, lets our Federal and military retirees know that regardless of what else happens, they will receive a cost of living allowance in 1987. By passing this bill today, the House of Representatives will actually be doing two things: First we'll guarantee a COLA for our Federal and military retirees, but second we'll be letting these groups know that we have appreciated their past sacrifices in the name of national economic recovery.

Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 4060, and amendments clarifying this measure's applicability to recipients of military, foreign service, and other Federal employee retirement benefits. What we discuss here today is a simple matter of equity. Since 1981, 1.5 million civil service retirement annuitants have been denied almost one-third of the COLA benefits guaranteed under Federal law. During the same period, millions of Social Security pensioners have received full COLA's. Last fiscal year, scheduled Federal retirement COLA's were eliminated as a result of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction legislation.

Federal and military retirees have borne the brunt of the deficit reduction effort long enough. COLA reductions and freezes represent an unacceptable erosion of basic retirement benefits, and hit Federal and military retirees living on fixed incomes just as hard as Social Security annuitants. In all fairness, the Federal Government should not renege on its responsibility to ensure that pensions keep pace with inflation, and we should apply this principle to all individuals who receive pensions from the Federal Government, not just those receiving Social Security benefits.

It is unconscionable that the Reagan administration so consistently seeks to cancel COLA's for retired Federal workers. To ensure a competent and well-motivated Federal work force, we must take care of our own. This legislation guarantees a full COLA for all Federal and military retirees in fiscal year 1987, and will prevent any 11th-hour attempts by the administration to eliminate COLA's during the coming fiscal year, and will insulate Federal retiree COLA's from any adverse effects under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which exempted Social Security and veterans' compensation and pensions from COLA cuts.

Too many promises to Federal retirees have been broken. I urge my colleagues to strike a blow for fairness and pass this important legislation. I commend my colleague and friend Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR for her tireless efforts on behalf of Federal workers and retirees, and her excellent work in bringing this legislation to the floor today. Thank you.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, a bill guaranteeing that our Nation's civil service and military retirees receive their cost-of-living increase on January 1, 1987. Passage of this legislation is vital if we are in fact going to begin to correct the injustice that has been directed at these Americans over the past several years, but most notably, since the adoption of the Gramm-Rudman law.

Under current law, civil service retirees and their survivors receive a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] based on the Consumer Price Index. The COLA is to be paid on January 1 of each year. That is the law. It contains automatic spending reductions necessary to achieve specified deficit reductions. When the first round of these cuts was put into effect, with it came the elimination of the 1986 COLA for Federal retirees.

This legislation directs that all civil service retirees shall receive a full cost-of-living adjustment for 1987 to be paid in January. It would in effect bar a second round of sequestration which may be ordered under Gramm-Rudman from again depriving these individuals of their COLA's.

The Gramm-Rudman law itself did exempt Social Security as well as veterans pensions from automatic cuts but left Federal retiree COLA's susceptible to reductions. In fact so vulnerable, they were wiped out entirely for this year.

Federal retirees, like all other retirees have to cope with greatly reduced incomes, sometimes as much as 50 percent less than they received during their peak earning years. Therefore, adjustments for inflation are critical in order to stretch their dollars farther. The fact of it is that the elderly consume a greater amount of their income on necessities than do other groups. It is for this reason that we must provide steps to allow them at least keep pace with inflation.

I opposed the Gramm-Rudman law and would prefer to see it repealed. However, it is the law of the land and at least as it relates to last year, it superseded other laws to the direct detriment of groups such as civil service and military retirees. It is an unjust law, and it is flawed from a legal and economic standpoint. Expectations are the Supreme Court will rule sequestration to be unconstitutional. Yet until they do, Congress must take steps to protect its Federal retirees. H.R. 4060 does just that.

Before I close, let me pay tribute to the outstanding work done on this legislation by my friend and colleague from Ohio [MARY ROSE OAKAR]. She has been a true champion of the Federal retirees. Let me also salute the out-

standing work of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees for their constancy of commitment and advocacy for their membership. Theirs is a valid and just cause.

Mr. BARNES. I strongly support H.R. 4060, which requires a full COLA in fiscal year 1987. This legislation reaffirms our commitment to fairness, a commitment that provisions of the Gramm-Rudman law trampled last March in the stampede toward sequestered budget savings. Over 1 million Federal retirees and their survivors, many counting upon the 3.1 percent increase for fiscal year 1986, watched Congress literally snatch it away with one hand while protecting the Social Security COLA with the other hand.

Because the Federal COLA serves a constituency far smaller than Social Security's, both the administration and Congress have preyed upon its vulnerability. We will have paid Federal retirees one 3.5 percent COLA in the 42-month period since the 1983 COLA. This year's freeze comes on top of four other major delays in COLA payments and the elimination of the semiannual COLA.

Clearly, the majority in the House who have cosponsored this important legislation recognize that inflation protection very often spells the margin of difference between dignified retirement and daily struggle for older Americans retired from public service careers.

I congratulate the distinguished Chair of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her leadership in bringing this issue to the floor.

I also want to salute my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], for his efforts on behalf of military retirees who have served this Nation faithfully. It has been my privilege to serve with the gentleman on the House Budget Committee and to work with him for a full COLA in fiscal year 1987. Hopefully, we will find a way to break the current impasse in the budget conference and pass a budget that meets the $144 billion deficit target responsibly.

Mr. DINGELL Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, legislation that will protect the 1987 cost-of-living adjustments for civil service, military, and railroad retirees.

In particular, I want to thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits Ms. [OAKAR], and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. FORD, for agreeing to include railroad retirees under the rubric of this legislation.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, railroad retirement tier II COLA's are subject under Gramm-Rudman to the same reduction or suspension as civil service and military retirement COLA's. Thus, it is entirely fitting and appropriate that railroad retirees be given the same protections as these other retired workers.

I would observe, as well, that the military retirement provisions of this bill, as amended, will also ensure the payment of COLA's in 1987 to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, whose retirement system also falls within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee. And so Chairman FORD and Chairwoman OAKAR, as well as the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. ASPIN, have my thanks on this score, too.

The grossly inequitable treatment given by Gramm-Rudman to the millions of retired Americans who spent their working lives in the civil service, the military, and the railroad industry was just one of the many reasons I opposed that legislation and voted against it at every turn. H.R. 4060 is an important step in rectifying one of Gramm-Rudman's worst provisions, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice in strong support of H.R. 4060. This bill calls for the same treatment in protection against the effects of inflation for civil service and military retirees as we have provided for Social Security recipients.

I want to compliment the gentlelady from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], for her leadership on this basic issue of fairness. The existence of this legislation, and the fact that a majority of the House have joined as cosponsors, was a strong influence on the Budget Committee in recommending cost-of-living adjustments for Federal retirees in fiscal year 1987.

In the past 3 years, inflation has risen by 10.1 percent. Social Security recipients have received a full COLA for each of these years. But Federal retirees have not. They have received but one COLA, 3.1 percent in fiscal year 1984. In fairness, we should consider restoring the lost earning power Federal retirees have already absorbed. Despite what some might contend, they are not as a group affluent. Their average retirement benefit is only $11,064, compared to $13,004 for private companies in a recent survey. Both private and Federal workers retire, on average, at age 61. At a minimum, we have a responsibility, even in these times of budget constraint to protect these individuals from the ravages of inflation.

I am also pleased that the provisions of H.R. 4671, which I cosponsored with the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], have been included in this legislation. This insures that military and other Federal retirees receive the same treatment in order to protect against the ravages of inflation.

This legislation will help accomplish this important task.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060, which will ensure a cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees. Last year, one group of our Nation's citizens was unfairly singled out by the passage of Gramm-Rudman. Although this law preserved the COLA for Social Security recipients, it seized that same benefit from Federal retirees by eliminating the scheduled January 1986 COLA from their annuity checks.

While I continue to be very concerned about our budget deficit, I feel strongly that the burden of balancing the budget should not fall disproportionately upon Federal retirees. It is simply unfair to single out some retirees for reductions while others remain exempt. We entered a contract with our Nation's civil servants. They have kept their end of the bargain. We in the Congress must fulfill our end of the bargain, too.

We cannot change the past. H.R. 4060 is an expression of the Congress that this should not happen again. Our Nation's Federal retirees deserve fair and equal treatment under the law. I wish to commend Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR of Ohio for the fine work she has done in bringing this legislation to the floor today and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4060, which would restore the cost-of-living increase to Federal retirees in 1987. I want to commend Chairwoman OAKAR for her undying commitment to the Federal employees and retirees.

As Chairwoman OAKAR is well aware, the Federal Government in the past few years has imposed several restrictions which resulted in benefit reductions for present and future civil service, military, and social security retirees. Last year's elimination of retirees' COLA was unfair and wrong in that Federal employees were singled out to bare the brunt of efforts to reduce the Federal deficit.

This trend toward singling out the civil servant to cut Federal spending is unjust. Inflation has risen 10.1 percent over the past 3 years. Social Security recipients have received a full COLA for each of these years. Federal and military retirees have not been as fortunate. In fact, military and Federal retirees have received only one COLA increase during the past 3 years. This is grossly unfair.

Federal retirees were one of the first casualties of the 1986 Gramm-Rudman cuts. Social Security recipients, however, were exempted from similar reductions, along with veterans compensation and pensions, and unemployment compensation. Not only did Gramm-Rudman result in the elimination of Federal retirees' 1986 COLA's, but Federal retiree COLA's were cancelled 3 months earlier than other budget cuts required by Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is unfair, unjust, and highly discriminatory. Last year Congress adequately addressed the 1986 COLA issue by recommending a full COLA in the budget resolution. This sudden reversal of the 1986 COLA for Federal retirees is a perfect example of Gramm-Rudman's unbalanced approach to correcting the deficit problem. This unbalanced approach is my primary reason for voting against Gramm-Rudman. Although I would like to correct the damage done by Gramm-Rudman and restore the full 1986 COLA, the matter before us today is the 1987 COLA.

H.R. 4060 would grant civil service retirees a full COLA in 1987 and protect that COLA from any cuts if automatic spending is triggered under Gramm-Rudman. Both the House and Senate have assumed a 2-percent COLA increase in their budget resolutions.

This is only fair. Private sector retirees do not face annual threats of losing their COLA. In fact, the President has requested a 3.7-percent COLA for Social Security recipients in his budget. Federal retirees should have the same assurance that they can continue to have their annuities adjusted according to the Consumer Price Index. Denying COLA's to Federal retirees only presents undue hardships to these seniors, many of whom are already living on a very limited income. Federal retirees should receive the same consideration as Social Security beneficiaries.

The same holds true for all Federal, railroad, and military retirees. All deserve to receive their 1987 COLA. They too could be denied their COLA for the duration of Gramm-Rudman. I commend Congressman FAZIO for introducing H.R. 4671, which I was happy to cosponsor. I also commend Chairwoman OAKAR's acceptance of Representative FAZIO's bill and the inclusion of railroad and military retirees in her well-crafted legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on another note, let me say that recent actions by Congress are making Federal employment quite unappealing. Threats of holiday furloughs, double jeopardy pension and Social Security deductions, and pay freezes, all are sending powerful statements to employees and prospective employees that the Federal Government does not live up to its word and is not committed to adequately compensating Federal employees and retirees.

The proposed elimination of the "3-year recovery" rule in the tax reform bill would further turn prospective employees away from devoting their careers to the Federal Government. Under the tax proposal, Federal retirees would be required to begin paying taxes on their annuities immediately upon retirement. Current law gives retirees 3 years to draw their already taxed contribution before they have to begin paying taxes on their annuity. People are literally rushing, in rates already double usual retirement rates, to retire by June 30, next week, in order to avoid falling prey to the House provision which would eliminate the rule on July 1. It is unfair to force people to retire under the uncertainty of retroactive legislation which may or may not become law and by eliminating one of the very benefits which the Federal Government has advertised as part of its retirement plan.

H.R. 4060 is one small, but important step to reverse this trend. Congress must act to ensure inflation protection to the very people who have worked so hard to make our Government function effectively. Civil servants deserve the same protection and fairness as private sector retirees. Federal retirees have continually witnessed delays, cuts, and total elimination of COLA's. Unless we act now, civil service, railroad, and military retirees stand to have their COLA's eliminated every year for the next 5 years. Let us learn from our mistakes. Let us guarantee fairness and equity for all retirees.

Again, I would like to commend chairwoman OAKAR for her relentless efforts to protect the COLA's of all Federal, railroad, and military retirees.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my colleague, MARY ROSE OAKAR, for introducing H.R. 4060, and successfully shepherding it through the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and onto the House floor. I strongly support this legislation.

H.R. 4060 would, as you know, mandate that a full cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] reflecting the full increase in the Consumer Price Index be paid to Federal retirees for 1987 from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. I understand that when Ms. OAKAR moves to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4060, her motion will include a provision to incorporate all Federal, railroad and military retirees under the terms of H.R. 4060.

You will recall that the scheduled 3.1 percent January 1986 COLA due to Federal, railroad and military retirees was rescinded in accord with the so-called Gramm-Rudman budget bill. I voted against Gramm-Rudman because I believed then, and continue to believe, that Federal, railroad and military retirees were treated unfairly. Essentially the Congress endorsed the idea that it was acceptable, by electing not to pay COLA's, to permit the erosion, by inflation, of the value of civil service and other annuities.

I've received scores of letters in support of H.R. 4060 from my constituents. Their concerns are basically the same as mine. Federal, railroad and military retirees counted on receiving full COLA's when planning for their retirement, and now feel that Congress has changed the rules in the middle of the game.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that, even with the constraints of Gramm-Rudman, restoration of the COLA for Federal, railroad, and military retirees would not impact on the deficit, but would merely necessitate small reductions in other programs. Given these circumstances, H.R. 4060 will let our Nation's Federal retirees know that we appreciate their years of public service. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4060, I urge the Congress to pass this legislation, in the interest of fairness to Federal civil service, and postal retirees across the Nation.

Nearly everyone agrees that reducing the Federal deficit is this country's most urgent domestic priority. With the passage of the deficit reduction amendments of 1985—the Gramm-Rudman law—this Congress has demonstrated its resolve to tackle this issue.

Necessary as it was, however, the deficit reduction law imposes a continuing unfair burden on postal and civil service retirees by suspending their cost-of-living adjustments [COLA's].

A review of the recent history of these COLA's suggests that this provision of the law requires these retirees to give more than their fair share. In 1984 even before this law was enacted, the COLA for Federal and postal retirees was suspended for 6 months, and again this year these retirees had to completely forfeit their COLA's. Without H.R. 4060, they face this unpleasant prospect for yet another year. No other group of retirees or senior citizens has been asked—or required—to give as much.

H.R. 4060 resolves this inequity by ensuring that these retirees receive their COLA's irrespective of the Gramm-Rudman law. It's the fair, equitable, and responsible thing to do. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, a bill that ensures Federal annuitants a cost-of-living adjustment in their annuities in January 1987. The bill further protects those annuities by ensuring that the COLA scheduled for 1987 will not be reduced or suspended by law or Executive order during the calendar year.

Mr. Speaker, Federal retirees have been hit especially hard during the recent era of budget austerity. Approximately 1.5 million Federal retirees were denied a COLA last January by Gramm-Rudman while other automatic cuts required by the law did not occur until March. Over the past 5 years, Federal retirees have received only 70 percent of the COLA's to which they are entitled by law.

Federal retirees have borne a disproportionate burden in balancing the Federal budget. It is time we began to treat Federal retirees with the respect they deserve for a lifetime of faithful service to their country. H.R. 4060 sends a clear message to Federal retirees that we remember and appreciate their contributions to Government service.

I commend the chair of the Compensation and Employee Benefits Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Ms. OAKAR, for offering this legislation. I am proud to be a cosponsor and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4060.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to guarantee future cost-of-living adjustments for Federal civilian and military retirees. These COLA's were victims of the automatic across-the-board cuts effective March 1 due to the Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1986.

Everyone agrees that the reduction of our country's $200 billion deficit should remain a priority for Congress. It is rightly argued that bequeathing such a debt to our children is wrong and unconscionable.

It is, however, grossly unfair to single out the civil service—both Federal civilian and military retirees—in the process of reducing the deficit. Deficit reduction must occur, but it must occur in a fair and equitable manner. Military and civilian retirees should not be made scapegoats for the high budget deficit.

We arrived in this deficit situation through many years of irresponsible spending. No particular group caused this deficit, and it is unfair to single out the Federal retirees in rectifying the situation in which we currently find ourselves.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 4060, I urge others to join me in restoring the COLA's for our retirees. Federal civilian and military retirees have worked hard and contributed throughout their lives to a retirement system that was promised to them. It is callous to single out such a group and deny such benefits in the name of "deficit reduction."

Let us continue to strive toward the goal of reducing the deficit. Deficit reduction must not be placed solely upon the shoulders of a group of individuals who need and deserve the benefits they have earned. Let us rectify this injustice by passing H.R. 4060.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to voice my support for H.R. 4060, Congresswoman OAKAR'S bill to provide a guaranteed cost-of-living adjustment for Federal retirees in 1987.

Let me first thank Congresswoman OAKAR and her staff for their efforts on behalf of Federal employees, and in particular, for her leadership on the issue of providing COLA equity to Federal retirees.

Mr. Speaker, the thrust of my argument in favor of this legislation can be summarized in one word—and that word is "fairness." It is not that Federal retirees are unwilling to do

their fair share in fighting the deficit, but when the Congress approved deficit reduction legislation, it proceeded to exempt nearly three-fourths of the Government's programs, thereby leaving Federal retirees and others to bear the brunt of the budget cuts.

I did not object when this Congress put the Social Security program COLA off limits from deficit reduction, but not to do the same for Federal retirees simply tells me that they were unfairly discriminated against because they had worked in the Federal Government. By what logic can we ever expect to attract the best and the brightest to Washington to serve in the Federal Government if the Congress treats Federal retirees in such a callous manner.

Mr. Speaker, so often, debates of this kind are couched in terms of budget numbers, but I would like to relay to my colleagues a story that might give us a more personal perspective on this issue. Recently, an 85-year-old widow retiree visited my office and told me that many of us as a result of the COLA elimination, many of her friends, whom are also widowed, are now living below the poverty level. Notwithstanding, she told me that the majority of those women are too proud to come to my office and "complain" about their situations.

My only regret is that I cannot now tell her that the Congress is completely removing the Federal retiree from the Gramm-Rudman process altogether, by treating our Federal retirees the same as their counterparts on Social Security, and thus relieving her of the fear that next year or the year after she may have her COLA reduced or canceled outright.

Nevertheless, she, her friends, and all Federal retirees will be pleased to know that the Congress is about to begin the first step to ensuring a COLA for this year. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I ask you to support fairness, COLA equity, and H.R. 4060.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, which will ensure a cost-of-living adjustment [COLA] for Federal, railroad, and military retirees in fiscal year 1987. I am pleased that this measure, of which I am a cosponsor, has received such widespread support in the House of Representatives.

In the past 3 years, inflation has risen by 10.1 percent. However, military and Federal retirees have received only one COLA increase during this period, a 3.1-percent increase in 1984.

The Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget Act made this bad situation much worse. Under Gramm-Rudman, $12 billion in mandatory budget cuts were made in a wide variety of Federal programs, including education, mass transit, health care, pollution control, and programs for the elderly.

However, as has so often been the case, Federal retirees were the first to suffer from attempts to reduce the Federal deficit. In January, when Social Security recipients received a 3.1-percent increase, the Federal retiree COLA was withheld under the Gramm-Rudman law. And barring any legislative change, Gramm-Rudman could result in a loss of the Federal retiree COLA for the next 5 years.

I strongly oppose the Gramm-Rudman Balanced Budget Act. I voted against this act when it was considered in the House of Representatives. After it was passed, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4020, calling for its repeal.

A U.S. district court has ruled that a key provision of the Gramm-Rudman balanced budget law is unconstitutional. This ruling has been appealed to the Supreme Court, which will likely rule on the case shortly. In the interim, the $12 billion in mandatory cuts that have already been made remain in effect. If the Gramm-Rudman process is upheld in court, we will be forced to make $50 to $60 billion in additional cuts by October. Cuts of this size will severely harm all low- and middle-income Americans.

H.R. 4060 will respond to this situation by ensuring that Federal retirees are not continually called on to bear a disproportionate share of deficit reduction efforts in the coming year. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I also call upon my colleagues to go one step further and throw their support behind H.R. 4020, which calls for an outright repeal of the Gramm-Rudman law. Passage of this legislation will not only protect Federal workers and retirees, but it will protect all Americans who are threatened by massive budget reductions under this misguided response to the deficit crisis.

We cannot tolerate a response to the deficit crisis that attacks human needs indiscriminately and ignores the twin illnesses of extravagant military spending and an unfair Tax Code. Rather, we must repeal Gramm-Rudman and get on with the task of reducing the deficit in an equitable fashion. This task will require strong efforts to cut unnecessary defense expenditures and to gain additional revenues by closing unfair loopholes in the Tax Code.

If we hope to maintain a Federal work force that is hardworking and devoted to the best interests of our Nation, we must ensure that Federal workers and retirees are treated fairly. And if we hope to preserve a Government that serves the needs of its citizens, we must ensure that the Federal budget is fair and equitable.

But so long as Gramm-Rudman remains the law of the land, neither of these goals will be achieved. I strongly urge my colleagues to join in the effort to repeal Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 4060, as amended by the gentlewoman from Ohio.

As many of my colleagues know, I introduced a bill, H.R. 4025, this past January which would correct the injustice contained in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Unlike the bill we are discussing today, my bill would exempt Federal, military, and tier II railroad retirees' cost-of-living adjustments from automatic sequestration for the life of the act, fiscal years 1986 through 1991. However, I support the passage of H.R. 4060 because it begins to address the issue of equity and justice for our retirees.

The budget resolutions of both Houses provide for a fiscal year 1987 COLA for civil service, military, and tier II railroad retirees. This bill would reaffirm that earlier decision by both Houses. Therefore, the House is not contradicting its earlier support for the Balanced Budget Act, but rather acting in concert with its duties to provide the proper mix of fiscal spending within the mandated budgetary limitations.

Our military and Federal retirees have suffered a great injustice, not only as result of the new budget law, but prior to that as well. They have been caught in the vice of deficit reduction since the explosion of red ink in fiscal year 1982 and beyond. The Congress has sought to protect the aged, the handicapped, and the poor from both budget cuts and inflation, yet has let our retirees slip through the cracks. During the last 3 years, inflation has risen by 10.1 percent, while retirees have received only one COLA of 3.1 percent. That loss of purchasing power not only lowers their standard of living, but also violates a good-faith contract between the Government and its employees for a fair and equitable retirement. Our civilian and military employees receive a lower rate of compensation than they would in the private sector. The equitable retirement system has helped compensate for that discrepancy and allowed the Government to retain the qualified personnel we have today.

I wish that we had been able to address this injustice on a broader scale. While H.R. 4060 as amended would provide for the fiscal year 1987 COLA, my bill would restore the 1986 COLA and exempt Federal, military, and tier II railroad retirees from future sequestration. By not restoring the 1986 COLA, we will still be allowing our retirees' standard of living to decline, because their base pay has slipped due to the rescission of the 1986 COLA. Furthermore, Congress should remove retirees' COLA's from the future threat of automatic sequestration, as my bill would do. It is unfair to those men and women who have given a lifetime of service to their fellow citizens in our Government, our military, and our railroads that their livelihoods should be held hostage on a ledger sheet. Let us pass this bill and move forward to address the problem in total, and restore equity and justice to our Federal retirement programs.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 4060. I would like to commend the gentlelady from Ohio for introducing this legislation, and once again demonstrating her concern for and commitment to our Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill because it attempts to correct a gross inequity in the recently passed Gramm-Rudman Deficit Reduction Act of 1985. As we all know, Gramm-Rudman is not fair in its treatment of Federal and military retirees. There is no equity in granting full COLA's to Social Security and other fixed income recipients while denying the same to others. Accordingly, I am voting for H.R. 4060 as an effort to inject a degree of fairness in the implementation of Gramm-Rudman.

At the same time, I believe the solution to our mounting deficit problem is not exempting more programs from Gramm-Rudman's sequestration. I support making all programs subject to budget review, thus spreading the burden of inevitable reductions. Nevertheless,

until Congress is ready to act in this equitable manner, I cannot advocate the singling out of one set of COLA recipients for cuts while other recipients remain exempted.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many Federal and military retirees in my district who have contacted me on this issue. I received hundreds of calls and letters urging my support of this legislation and can honestly say that it made a difference.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4060, a bill to guarantee the 1987 cost-of-living-adjustment to Federal civil service, military, tier II railroad, CIA, Federal Employee Compensation Act, and Foreign Service retirees. This measure is designed to ensure that all Federal Government retirement benefits, like those of Social Security, are exempted from the automatic spending cuts imposed by the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction process.

Last January, Representative MARY ROSE OAKAR and I, along with 12 other Members of the House, introduced H.R. 4060 to reverse what we considered to be an injustice contained in Gramm-Rudman. By not exempting the cost-of-living-adjustments [COLA's] for civil service, military and railroad retirees, the President and the Congress broke a promise to Government employees to provide them with fair and equitable retirement benefits. Also, by not exempting the Federal retiree COLA's from Gramm-Rudman, we undermined the ability of the Federal Government to attract and retain qualified men and women to carry out the duties of Government.

The Gramm-Rudman measure, signed by President Reagan on December 12, 1985, has set in place the mechanism by which we have been forced to make the serious budget choices in order to gain control over the phenomenal growth of Federal budget deficits since 1981. These massive deficits are economically dangerous and must be reduced.

In reducing the Federal budget deficit, however, the President and the Congress should act fairly. The Gramm-Rudman legislation has been unfair to millions of Americans who have served the people of this Nation as Government employees and members of the military. It is they who lost their 1986 COLA's. Let us today support H.R. 4060, and begin to treat Federal Government retirees with the fairness they deserve as Americans.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, legislation to ensure the payment of cost-of-living adjustments to civil service and military retirees as scheduled on January 1, 1987.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that the House has acted in such an expedient manner to correct the serious inequity Gramm-Rudman-Hollings caused for these retirees. I opposed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings because it allows indiscriminate budget reductions to be made by a computer rather than Congress. The effect of this legislation on retirees is just one example of the adverse impact caused by budget reductions without the direct approval of Congress.

The more than 3.5 million Americans who chose to pursue careers in the military or with the Federal Government did so with certain expectations about the benefits that would be available to them upon their retirement. Among those benefits is a financially sound retirement program that provides annual cost-of-living adjustments.

With more than 250,000 military and civilian retirees living in Florida, 25,000 of whom live in Pinellas County which I represent, I know how difficult many retirees find it to make ends meet on a fixed income. They depend upon their annual cost-of-living adjustments to meet increases in the cost of medical care, housing, and food.

These Americans made Government and military service their careers and in so doing dedicated themselves to providing for the needs of our Nation. In return, with the passage and enactment of this legislation, we can fulfill our obligation to these retirees in their time of need.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4060 and I would commend the gentlelady from Ohio for her diligence and sensitivity in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is sorely needed to help correct an inequity included in the 1985 Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act—this inequity placed thousands of Federal retirees at the mercy of an anonymous and arbitrary budget cutter. Consequently, Federal retirees were deprived of their earned COLA due in January.

Mr. Speaker, Federal employees have for too long been given the short end of the stick: They have been asked to forego reasonable pay increases, they have been forced to accept RIF's, and they have been deprived a COLA year after year. Today, we want to reverse this trend. We want to restore what is rightfully due Federal retirees.

Mr. Speaker, Federal employees have made major sacrifices in recent years. They have had to accept a standard of living that is steadily eroding when considered relative to comparable private sector employment.

For their years of public service, Federal employees and retirees deserve better. Restoring the COLA is a step in the right direction and I urge my colleagues' support of this important effort.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4060, a bill to restore cost-of-living adjustment [COLA's] for civil service retirees in 1987. This important measure provides that payments from the civil service retirement and disability fund during 1987 will not be subject to any reduction or suspension pursuant to the Gramm-Rudman Act.

Last January, millions of Federal retirees opened their civil service retirement checks to find that they would not receive a cost-of-living increase. These retirees, who receive an average annuity of only $12,000 a year, were expecting a $31 increase last January when they were given less than 2 weeks' notice that they would not be receiving any COLA at all. Federal retirees have only received approximately 70 percent of the COLA's for which they have been eligible over the past 5 years, while millions of others, including some 37 million Social Security recipients, have received their full COLA's. During the past 3 years, inflation has risen a total of 10.1 percent. Social Security recipients properly received the full payable COLA for each of these years—3.5 percent in 1984; 3.5 percent in 1985; and 3.1 percent in 1986. Federal and military retirees, however, received one COLA increase during this same 3-year period; a 3.1 percent COLA paid in 1984.

Mr. Speaker, it is fundamentally unfair to single out Federal retirees to carry a disproportionate share of the burden for helping to reduce the Federal deficit. That is why I was pleased to join my colleague, Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR of Ohio, and others, in sponsoring H.R. 4060.

This legislation is a first step in restoring fairness for our Federal retirees. Last December, Congress passed and the President signed the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction bill—Public Law 99-177. That measure included a provision effectively canceling the payment of the 1986 COLA to our Federal and military retirees. I voted against Gramm-Rudman for this reason and others as well.

H.R. 4060 insures that the COLA which was denied to Federal retirees this year will be paid in 1987 despite the effects of Gramm-Rudman or any other statute. Inflation does not make a distinction in its impact between Federal retirees and their fellow citizens who once worked in the private sector. Congress should not, therefore, make a distinction in the payment of COLA's to Federal retirees.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4060, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 4060, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

## U.S. BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3559) to amend the act establishing a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States to clarify the status of employees of the Commission, to raise the limits on private contributions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3559

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

SECTION 1. OFFICIAL SEAL.

The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution", enacted September 29, 1983 (Public Law 98-101; 97 Stat. 719), hereinafter in this Act referred to as "Public Law 98-101", is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Commission shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.".

SEC. 2. COMMEMORATIONS BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

Section 3 of Public Law 98-101 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after the section designation; and

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

"(b) It is not the purpose of this Act to preempt any unit of State or local government from celebrating the bicentennial of the Constitution, and nothing in this Act shall prevent any such unit from establishing its own logo, symbol, or mark in connection therewith.".

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS AND POWERS.

Section 5 of Public Law 98-101 is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(2)(A), by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$250,000";

(2) in subsection (h)(2)(B) by striking out "$100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(k) The Commission may transfer funds received by it to another Federal department or agency if the Commission determines that the use of such funds by such department or agency would promote the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Constitution. This subsection is effective only to the extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts.

"(l) The Commission may issue rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this Act.".

SEC. 4. BICENTENNIAL LOGO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(j) of Public Law 98-101 is amended to read as follows:

"(j)(1) For the purpose of this Act, the term 'Bicentennial logo' means the symbol or mark designated by the Commission for use in connection with the commemoration of the bicentennial of the Constitution.

"(2) The Commission may, in accordance with rules and regulations which the Commission shall prescribe, authorize the manufacture, reproduction, use, sale, or distribution of the Bicentennial logo.

"(3) Rules and regulations referred to in paragraph (2) shall include provisions under which—

"(A) fees may be charged for any authorization under this subsection (including circumstances under which any such fee may be waived);

"(B) any authorization granted under this subsection shall not be subjected to reassignment or transfer without approval by the Commission; and

"(C) any authorization granted under this subsection may be revoked or otherwise terminated.

"(4)(A) Whoever, except as authorized under this subsection, manufactures, reproduces, uses, sells, or distributes the Bicentennial logo—

"(i) shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both; and

"(ii) shall be subject to a civil penalty in an amount equal to the amount of the fee which would have been payable by that person under paragraph (3)(A).

"(B) Section 701 of title 18, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the Bicentennial logo.

"(5) Amounts charged under paragraph (3)(A) shall be available to the Commission.

"(6) Notice of designation under paragraph (1) shall be published in the Federal Register.".

(b) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—(1) All rules and regulations issued by the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution in connection with section 5(j) of Public Law 98-101 (as in effect before the enactment of this Act) shall continue in effect, according to their terms, until modified, terminated, superseded, or repealed by such Commission.

(2) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced before the amendment made by subsection (a) becomes effective shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. Determinations with respect to any such suit, action, or other proceeding shall be made as if this Act had not been enacted.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO PERSONNEL.

Section 5 of Public Law 98-101 is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "(b) The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(b)(1) The";

(B) by striking out "compensation, without" and all that follows thereafter through "rates," and inserting in lieu thereof "compensation"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Chairman or the staff director or both may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take under the preceeding provisions of this paragraph.";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking out "(c) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "(2) The"; and

(B) by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Chairman or the staff director or both may, if so authorized by the Commission, take any action which the Commission is authorized to take under the preceding provisions of this paragraph.";

(3) by inserting before subsection (d) the following:

"(c) Appointments and compensation under subsection (b) (1) or (2) of this section may be made without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, government appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates."; and

(4) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking out paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (e)(1) as subsection (e).

SEC. 6. AGENCY COOPERATION

Section 6(c) of Public Law 98-101 is amended by adding at the end of the following: "All such governmental agencies and organizations shall cooperate with the Commission, to the extent allowed by law, in providing advice and assistance requested by the Commission.".

SEC. 7. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION

Section 7 of Public Law 98-101 is amended by striking out "1989" and inserting in lieu thereof "1991".

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR TWO ADDITIONAL YEARS.

Section 8 of Public Law 98-101 is amended by striking out "1989" and inserting in lieu thereof "1991".

SEC. 9. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsections (a)(4)(B), (a)(5)(iii), and (f) of section 4 of Public Law 98-615 (98 Stat. 3204), as amended by section 201 of Public Law 99-251 (100 Stat. 20), are each amended by striking out "Federal Employees Benefits Improvement Act of 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal Employees Benefits Improvement Act of 1986".

(2) Section 4(a)(5)(A) of Public Law 98-615, as so amended, is amended—

(A) by striking out "Paragraphs (2)," and inserting in lieu thereof "Paragraphs"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following: "The paragraphs referred to in the preceding sentence shall so apply only insofar as they relate to an election to provide a survivor annuity for a former spouse.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as of May 7, 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider under suspension of the rules H.R. 3559, a bill to amend the act establishing the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States. H.R. 3559 raises the limit on private contributions, authorizes the Commission to adopt a seal and a logo, makes technical changes regarding personnel practices, and extends the life of the Commission from 1989 to 1991. In this way, this bill will assist the Commission in carrying out its mandate as the primary coordinator of the activities surrounding the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of our Constitution.

Last Tuesday the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, Warren E. Burger, submitted his resignation. As we are all aware, his resignation was prompted by his desire to fulfill his responsibilities as Chairman of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the

U.S. Constitution. The reasons behind this departure exemplify Chief Justice Burger's devotion to the Constitution and his eagerness to educate our citizens on the history and significance of this important document.

The Commission has always stressed the importance of engaging the entire Nation in the events to commemorate the bicentennial of our Constitution. I believe that this view reflects Chief Justice Burger's desire to reach the millions of people who benefit from the Constitution and to acquaint them not only with their constitutional heritage, but also with the rights which they have as citizens of this Nation. To exemplify this point, I must make note of the lecture on the history of the Constitution which Chief Justice Burger gave to 45 junior high students from the South Bronx. His effort to take time out of his busy schedule to meet with the students of my district was greatly apreciated by all.

Chief Justice Burger's resignation represents a loss to the Supreme Court. During his 17 years of service at the Supreme Court, he has focused his attention on improvements for the administration of the judicial system. He has also taken great pains not only to discuss, but also to advocate for alternatives to incarceration.

What the Supreme Court has lost, the bicentennial Commission has gained, and the latter will most certainly benefit from Chief Justice Burger's talent, expertise, and commitment. I can only wish the best to Chief Justice Burger on his future endeavors.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3559. A bill to amend Public Law 99-101 which established a Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States.

The Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution will reacquaint the American people with the history and circumstances surrounding the Constitution—from its drafting to final ratification—and to better familiarize ourselves with the substantive provisions of this centerpiece of our democracy.

The Constitution of the United States represents the greatest leap forward in human history in setting the framework for our Government as we have known it for the last 200 years. It is a document that guarantees all men and women equality. In addition, it secures rights and freedoms unmatched anywhere in the world.

Our country is only as good and strong as the people who live within its borders. Our Nation's strength stems from a commonly held belief that ours is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The constitutional bicentennial presents an unparalleled opportunity to use modern technology and telecommunications to instill in our citizenry a greater sense and understanding of the rights, privileges, and opportunities the Constitution affords all American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need to allow the Commission the necessary tools in the planning for the historic anniversary. H.R. 3559 would amend the act which established the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution by clarifying the status of employees of the Commission, by raising the annual cap on individual and corporate limits on donations and sets standards for the use of the bicentennial's seal and logo.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which seeks to blend Federal and private initiatives and support into a truly national celebration of such an important event in our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, H.R. 3559, honoring a very significant event in our Nation's history, the 200th anniversary of the signing of our U.S. Constitution. At a time when only one-third of all the nations in the world are free and open societies, I think it is extremely important that we extend the time period for this commission to pass on a very important message, not only to our own Nation, but throughout the world.

This measure extends the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution for 2 additional years, through 1991. I am pleased to be able to speak in favor of this legislation, which was unanimously reported from the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of which I am a member. I am hopeful that the full House will support this measure so that the Commission may continue its good works.

The Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution was established in 1983 to plan the celebration to be held on September 17, 1987, honoring the 200th anniversary of the Constitutional Convention. In their September 1985 report outlining the progress of their efforts, the Commission enumerated plans for the celebration. These plans included the publication of a calendar of commemorative dates and events; a handbook of planned projects; a bicentennial newsletter; establishment of a national speakers' bureau; development of a variety of educational materials; and sponsorship of scholarships and bicentennial tree plantings. The Commission also recommended a one-time national holiday on September 17, 1987, to mark the 200th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution. Also noted in the Commission's report was their concern over the lack of time to adequately prepare for this important day in American history.

The legislation we are considering today, H.R. 3559, is a direct response to the Commission's concerns. This measure: First, extends the life of the Commission by 2 years from 1989 to 1991 and extends the authorizations for appropriations until the Commission expires in 1991; second, specifies that the Commission and its activities are not intended to preempt any State or local government from celebrating the bicentennial of the Constitution, nor to prevent them from establishing their own logo in connection with the event; third, raises the limit on annual contributions from $25,000 to $250,000 for individuals and from $100,000 to $1 million for corporate donors. Additionally, this bill grants the Commission power to transfer funds that it receives to other Federal departments or agencies when such a transfer promotes the commemoration of the bicentennial.

The recognition of the bicentennial of the signing of our Constitution is an important date that deserves appropriate commemoration. I applaud all 23 members of the Commission for their efforts to date, and for their dedication and concern that this important anniversary in our American history will not be forgotten.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 3559, extending the life of the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member as well as the appropriate subcommittee members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for their efforts in getting H.R. 3559, legislation to amend the act establishing the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, onto the floor of the House of Representatives for consideration. Representative BOGGS and I jointly introduced this legislation on behalf of the Commission, on which we have both been appointed to serve.

In 1983, I introduced the original House legislation to create a Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. The purpose of the Commission, as described in section 3 of Public Law 98-101, is to "promote and coordinate activities to commemorate the bicentennial of the Constitution." The Commission hopes that it will be

able to stimulate thousands of organizations at the grassroots level to educate the public on the Constitution and the unique aspects of this document which ensures freedom under law. In light of the fact that it has taken 2 years for the President to appoint the Commission, it is imperative that the amending legislation receive prompt attention so that the Commission can fully undertake the enormous task before it.

The challenge facing this Commission perhaps is best illustrated by comparing it to the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Administration [ARBA], after which our Commission is modeled. ARBA was formed in 1966 to plan the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. It has 10 years to organize and raise private funds, and enjoyed more than $118 million in appropriated funds. In contrast, with the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution slightly over a year away, fiscal year 1985 appropriations only amounted to $331,000. As a result of the efforts made in the Senate, the fiscal 1986 appropriation was raised from an original $775,000 to $12.5 million. Although this was a dramatic and necessary increase, it still pales in comparison to the $118 million ARBA had in 1976.

Due to the shortage of time, the Commission has respectfully asked that the original Act that established the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution be amended to clarify the status of employees of the Commission, to remove the limitation on the number of Commission staff who may be compensated through appropriated funds, and to raise the limits on private contributions.

The bill also contains a provision that would extend the life of the Commission from 1989 to 1991. The purpose is not just to extend the life of the Commission, but to commemorate the entire ratifying process of the original document. Although by 1789, the Constitution was ratified by all the original States except Rhode Island, it was done so with the caveat that a bill of rights would be added shortly thereafter. The Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution was not ratified by the requisite number of States until 1791. For this reason, I believe that it is fitting to extend the life of the Commission to correspond with the entire bicentennial celebration of our original Constitution. The Bill of Rights was an integral part of the concept of the U.S. Constitution and deserves recognition by this Commission and the people of the United States.

In closing, it should be remembered that while our Nation may be one of the younger nations in the world, it has the oldest, relatively unchanged, form of Government in the entire world. The U.S. Constitution is considered such an act of genius that it is the most frequently used constitutional model for developing and restructuring countries. Almost 200 years ago the framers of our Constitution fashioned a nearly perfect instrument of Government, one that has demonstrated the remarkable capacity to adapt to a changing world. The Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States desperately needs the support of the 99th Congress to ensure that proper recognition and tribute is paid to this truly great achievement.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the excellent remarks of the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS]; but before doing so, I would just like to say as far as the committee is concerned, the gentlewoman has been the spearhead and the Member who has really given us the leadership in terms of what the Bicentennial Commission is all about. I think it is due to her work and the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] as well, but we are especially and deeply appreciative of the role of the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. BOGGS] in this Bicentennial Commission.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. I thank him especially for those very nice remarks.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3559, a bill that would amend Public Law 98-101, the act which established the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution of the United States.

The purpose of this legislation, as we have heard from the other speakers, is to clarify the status of certain employees of the Commission, to permit the licensing of the Commission's logo, and to raise the limits of private contributions, among others.

As the gentleman from Illinois has stated, there are several Members of Congress on the Commission on the Bicentennial. There are 20 Members appointed by the President and there are three ex-officio Members.

I serve on the Commission as the Speaker's designee and our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] serves on the Commission, as does the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. THURMOND; the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY; the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS; the Senator from Arizona, Mr. DECONCINI. We have heard the chairman of the Commission, Chief Justice Warren Burger, extolled in a very eloquent support by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

The Commission, of course, is charged with coordinating the commemoration of the Constitution's 200th anniversary. Its Members are eager to meet the challenge of our chairman, the Chief Justice, which is to provide a meaningful series of programs that will promote a better understanding of what 200 years of history under the U.S. Constitution has meant to the American people.

There will be nationwide essay contests, bicentennial class competitions, films, calendars, books, posters and exhibits, television specials, and special ceremonies in many cities and States around the country.

The 30 States that thus far have formed Bicentennial Commissions are being joined each day by others and by city commissions as well.

The National Commission will support and encourage the develoment of area programs at all levels of Government and throughout the private sector.

The bill has been amply described by all the previous speakers. In summary, it would provide authority for the Commission to control the use of the official emblem of the Bicentennial and to license its use to the public. It would authorize the Commission to adopt an official seal. It would exempt some Civil Service regulations relating to classification and pay of commission staff members paid with privately donated funds.

It would raise the ceiling on amounts that individuals can contribute to help carry out the Commission's program and it would extend the life of the Commission, as we have heard, from 1989, the anniversary of the ratification and the establishment of the Government under the Constitution, to 1991 when the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were adopted.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] should be especially commended and congratulated for bringing this legislation before the House.

I must say also that we should commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who is the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TAYLOR], who is the ranking member of the full committee, for their expeditious handling of this legislation.

We cannot fail to give the highest amount of appreciation to and commendation for their work to the staff members of the two subcommittees who unselfishly and in a very concerted bipartisan effort during all the hearings were able to bring this bill to a conclusion and bring it before us today on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 3559. It will add tremendously to the ability of the Commission to coordinate the coming observance of the 200th anniversary of our Constitution.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of H.R. 3559. As you know, H.R. 3559 was introduced by Congresswoman LINDY BOGGS, a member of the Bicentennial Commission of the U.S. Constitution, and was jointly referred to my Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits and the Subcommittee on Census and Population, which is chaired by my colleague, Congressman ROBERT GARCIA. The bill makes technical changes to the public law establishing a Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution.

H.R. 3559 was approved by the subcommittees on February 20, 1986, and by the full Post Office and Civil Service Committee on March 12, 1986. An amendment was approved by the subcommittees and full committee which would give the Commission more flexibility in hiring support staff.

In September 1983, the President signed into law Public Law 98-101, designating the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. The 1983 law provides for 23 Commissioners to plan celebration activities to honor the 200th anniversary of the constitutional convention on September 17, 1987. Unfortunately, while the law was enacted in September 1983, Commissioners were not appointed until July 16, 1985. The 2-year delay has caused both logistical and fiscal problems for the Commission, placing constraints on their ultimate purpose of planning a celebration to commemorate the Constitution.

The bill under suspension today clarifies the policy for hiring staff, raises the limit on private contributions, and extends the duration of the Commission to 1991, the 200th anniversary of the Bill of Rights.

Last session, the Commission was fortunate enough to receive several appropriations for salaries and expenses. First, the continuing resolution appropriated $12 million for the Commission. Second, $775,000 was appropriated through State, Commerce, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations legislation. Finally, amendments to the Arts and Humantities Foundations appropriated $25 million for the Commission's salaries and expenses over a 5-year duration.

In addition to appropriating money to the Bicentennial Commission on the U.S. Constitution, Public Law 99-190, further continuing appropriations for 1986 lifted the maximum hiring limit of 5 publicly paid employees and 20 employees detailed from Federal agencies. As a consequence of the passage of Public Law 99-190, it was necessary for my subcommittee to consider an amendment of H.R. 3559 which conforms to the changes I mentioned.

The amendment adopted by the Compensation Subcommittee on February 20 removes the sections from H.R. 3559 regarding personnel practices which were duplicated in the continuing resolution. The amendment also authorizes the Commission to hire personnel without regard to the Federal classification systems and the General Schedule pay rates. The Commission has requested this authority because of its short duration and its uncertain funding levels. The Commission has assured me that their hiring procedures will be based on fair and equitable standards.

This legislation is particularly significant in light of last week's events at the Supreme Court. As all of you know, Chief Justice Warren Burger, in stepping down from his position on the Supreme Court, stated that he will devote all his energies to organizing the commemoration of the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. Chief Justice Burger noted in his formal remarks about his resignation that time is running out and much work needs to be done prior to the Nation's celebration. Certainly, the passage of H.R. 3559 will assist the Chief Justice and the other Commission members greatly. I urge all Members of this body to vote favorably for it.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as one of the authors of the legislation which established the Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3559.

This bill extends the life of the Commission for 2 years so they can adequately complete their work, clarifies the status of Commission employees, and raises the limit on contributions that individuals and corporations can donate to the Commission. If this momentous event is to be commemorated properly, the Commission needs the time, the staff, and the money to do it.

Mr. Speaker, as a history buff, I have long been interested in commemorating the bicentennial properly. One of the key events leading to the drafting of our Constitution—Shays' Rebellion—occurred in my district. A small group of rebels, led by the farmer Daniel Shays, stormed courthouses in western Massachusetts to call attention to the problems with the Articles of Confederation. The small rebellion, it is said, frightened George Washington out of retirement and led to the drafting of the Constitution. I have introduced a bill to commemorate the bicentennial of Shays' Rebellion. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring that bill.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that doing this bill today is especially appropriate in light of the announcement last week by the distinguished Chief Justice, Warren Burger, that he was leaving the Supreme Court to devote his full energies to the Bicentennial Commission.

Mr. Speaker, that is admirable. Warren Burger is one of the most distinguished jurists in our Nation's history, and there is no finer man in this country that could possibly serve as Chairman of the Commission. He cares that the celebration be done properly, and is doing a great job at it now.

Mr. Speaker, when Benjamin Franklin was walking through Philadelphia after the Constitution had been drafted, he was asked by a woman what type of government had been created by the Founding Fathers. Franklin responded, "A republic, Madam, if you can keep it."

Well, we have kept it—for nearly 200 years—and the Bicentennial Commission is the best way to celebrate all that our Nation means to us, to "We the People," and to the world. I urge support for the legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3559, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## 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 bill just under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1530

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore: (Mr. MURTHA). Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which the motion was entertained, and then on a motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Monday, June 23, 1986.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 345, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 347, by the yeas and nays;

Senate Joint Resolution 361, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4060, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3559, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 4252, by the yeas and nays;

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote in this series.

## EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING DEMOCRACY IN REPUBLIC OF KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution House Concurrent Resolution 345.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 345, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—414

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

NOT VOTING—19

Bentley
Breaux
Campbell
Collins
Craig
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Fowler
Grotberg
Johnson
Luken
Nichols
O'Brien
Parris
Rodino
Roukema
Shumway
Sikorski
Weaver

□ 1540

Mr. ROTH and Mr. DELAY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1550

## EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA AND REDUCTION OF TENSIONS ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 347.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 347, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—403

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
de la Garza
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer

Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
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
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Meyers
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—30

Bentley
Breaux
Campbell
Collins
Craig
Davis
Dixon
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Fowler
Grotberg
Hefner
Holt
Luken
McDade
McMillan
Michel
Mrazek
Nichols
O'Brien
Pickle
Robinson
Rodino
Savage
Saxton
Shumway
Sikorski
Stratton
Weaver
Wilson

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## TO DISINVEST CHILEAN TALL SHIP "ESMERALDA" FROM FOURTH OF JULY CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 361.

The clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARNES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 361, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 223, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—194

Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnes
Bartlett
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Berman
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Coyne
Crockett
Daschle
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Garcia
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes
Heftel
Henry
Hertel
Howard
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lantos
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Long
Lowry (WA)
Lundine
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
Meyers
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Neal
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Rahall
Rangel
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Roukema
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Visclosky
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Zschau

NAYS—223

Akaka
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Archer
Armey
Badham
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bereuter
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Bosco
Boulter
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carr
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Flippo
Ford (MI)
Franklin
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall, Ralph
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hefner
Hendon
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nelson
Nielson
Olin
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Petri
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Ray
Regula
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wortley
Wright
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—16

Bentley
Breaux
Campbell
Collins
Craig
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Fowler
Grotberg
Luken
Nichols
O'Brien
Rodino
Shumway
Sikorski
Weaver

□ 1600

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

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

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4060, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4060, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 19, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—396

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Biliraki
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
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
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—19

Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Brown (CO)
Cooper
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Fawell
Frenzel
Gradison
Gregg
Monson
Porter
Ray
Sensenbrenner
Smith, Denny (OR)
Stenholm
Walker

NOT VOTING—18

Bentley
Breaux
Burton (CA)
Campbell
Collins
Craig
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Fowler
Grotberg
Luken
Nichols
O'Brien
Rodino
Shumway
Sikorski
Weaver
Whitten

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, 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 amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the full cost-of-living adjustment in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund shall be made for 1987, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## U.S. BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3559, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3559, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 7, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—409

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Biliraki
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Franklin
Frenzel
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt

Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
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
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Lundine
Lungren
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—7

Barton
Brown (CO)
Cobey
Coble
Mack
Monson
Walker

NOT VOTING—17

Bentley
Breaux
Campbell
Collins
Craig
Dowdy
Eckert (NY)
Fish
Fowler
Grotberg
Luken
Nichols
O'Brien
Rodino
Shumway
Sikorski
Weaver

□ 1615

Messrs. STRANG, BARTON of Texas, and COBEY changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROEMER, WILSON, STRANG, and SAVAGE changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1987

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4252, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALGREN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4252, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 28, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—386

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

NAYS—28

Armey
Badham
Bartlett
Barton
Brown (CO)
Cheney
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gekas | Marlenee | Smith (NE) |
| Gregg | McCandless | Smith, Denny (OR) |
| Hansen | Miller (OH) | Stump |
| Hartnett | Monson | Tauke |
| Latta | Nielson | Walker |
| Lujan | Oxley | |
| Mack | Packard | |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bentley | Eckert (NY) | Porter |
| Breaux | Fowler | Rodino |
| Campbell | Grotberg | Shumway |
| Collins | Luken | Sikorski |
| Craig | Lundine | Weaver |
| Crane | Nichols | |
| Dowdy | O'Brien | |

□ 1625

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2180) to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but I do so for the purpose of clarifying the gentleman's unanimous-consent request.

I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 2180, as it came from the other body, contains the identical language to amend the Fire Prevention and Control Act. That was the bill just passed by the House as H.R. 4252.

In addition, it contains language which would amend the daylight savings provision, with which the gentleman is familiar.

Since the language adopted by the House for the fire prevention is identical to that contained in the Senate bill before us, it would facilitate the final action on the bill to be approved as it was sent over from the other body.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the Senate bill contains a daylight savings amendment that is nearly identical to the bill passed by the House last October. The only difference is that the Senate bill does not extend daylight savings time the extra week in the fall. This is an acceptable compromise. The gentleman's request is entirely consistent with the previously expressed will of the House, and it will avoid having to go through a lengthy procedural step to arrive at the same results. I support the gentleman's actions.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the change that has been made insofar as daylight savings time is acceptable to us. We give up the week in November which was the most controversial and keep the 3 weeks in April. I think the bill is a big change over present law, and I accept the compromise.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2180

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 17(f) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking "is" and inserting in lieu thereof "are"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period the following: "and $18,300,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987".

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that various studies of governmental and non-governmental agencies indicate that daylight saving time over an expanded period would produce a significant energy savings in electrical power consumption;

(2) that daylight saving time may yield energy savings in other areas besides electrical power consumption;

(3) that daylight saving time over an expanded period could serve as an incentive for further energy conservation by individuals, companies, and the various governmental entities at all levels of government, and that such energy conservation efforts could lead to greatly expanded energy savings; and

(4) that the use of daylight saving time over an expanded period could have other beneficial effects on the public interest, including the reduction of crime, improved traffic safety, more daylight outdoor playtime for the children and youth of our Nation, greater utilization of parks and recreation areas, expanded economic opportunity through extension of daylight hours to peak shopping hours and through extension of domestic office hours to periods of greater overlap with the European Economic Community.

(b) Section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260(a)) is amended by striking "last Sunday of April" and inserting in lieu thereof "first Sunday of April".

(c) Any law in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(2) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 by a State with parts thereof in more than one time zone, or

(2) adopted pursuant to section 3(a)(1) of such Act by a State that lies entirely within one time zone, shall be held and considered to remain in effect as the exercise by that State of the exemption permitted by such Act unless that state, by law, provides that such exemption shall not apply.

(d)(1) Notwithstanding any other law or any regulation issued under any such law, the Federal Communications Commission shall, consistent with any existing treaty or other agreement, make such adjustment by general rules, or by interim action pending such general rules, with respect to hours of operation of daytime standard amplitude modulation broadcast stations, as may be consistent with the public interest, including the public's interest in receiving interference-free service.

(2) Such general rules, or interim action, may include variances with respect to operating power and other technical operating characteristics.

(3) Subsequent to the adoption of such general rules, they may be varied with respect to particular stations and areas because of the exigencies in each case.

(e) This section shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, except that if such effective date occurs in any calendar year after March 1, this section shall take effect on the first day of the following calendar year.

The Senate bill 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.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4252) was laid on the table.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mrs. Emery, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates, the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 19, 1986:

H.R. 739. An act to make miscellaneous changes in laws affecting the U.S. Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

On May 20, 1986:

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution designating the week beginning on May 11, 1986, as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Week".

H.R. 737. An act for the relief of Ms. Chang Ai Bae; and

H.R. 1207. An act to award a special gold medal to the family of Harry Chapin.

On May 21, 1986:

H.R. 4767. An act to deauthorize the project for improvements at Racine Harbor, Wisconsin.

On May 23, 1986:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution designating the week of May 18, 1986, through May 24, 1986, as "National Food Bank Week."

On May 27, 1986:

H.R. 1349. An act to reduce the costs of operating Presidential libraries, and for other purposes.

On May 28, 1986:

H.J. Res. 492. Joint resolution to designate the week of June 1, 1986, as "National Neighborhood Housing Services Week";

H.J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 25, 1986, through May 31, 1986, as "Critical Care Week";

H.J. Res. 613. Joint resolution allowing qualified persons representing all the States to be naturalized on Ellis Island on July 3 or 4, 1986; and

H.R. 4382. An act to require the Architect of the Capitol to place a plaque at the original site of Providence Hospital.

On June 5, 1986:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution designating June 26, 1986, as "National Interstate Highway Day."

On June 6, 1986:

H.R. 2672. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a new retirement and disability plan for Federal employees, postal employees, and Members of Congress, and for other purposes.

On June 19, 1986:

H.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning June 15, 1986, as "National Safety in the Workplace Week";

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; and

H.R. 3570. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to reform and improve the Federal justices and judges survivors' annuities program, and for other purposes.

On June 23, 1986:

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution to designate October 8, 1986, as "National Fire Fighters Day."

## AUTHORIZING CHANGES IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 2414 RELATING TO INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 152) authorizing changes in the enrollment of S. 2414, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, but at this time I would not want to entertain an objection. This is a concurrent resolution which removes some doubt, as I understand it, regarding congressional intent of S. 2414 with regard to the effective date. Is that correct?

Mr. HUGHES. If the gentleman will yield, my request is that we consider this resolution and then immediately after its adoption consider S. 2414. This action will complete action on the Firearms Owners Protection Act.

On May 6 of this year, at the time the other body agreed to the House amendments to S. 49, it passed S. 2414 unanimously to accommodate a few of the most urgent concerns of the law enforcement community. However, the effective date of S. 2414 was not drafted to reflect the delayed effective date of S. 49. To correct the effective date, the other body this morning passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 152.

I am proposing that we first consider the technical correction to the effective date, Senate Congressional Resolution 512, and then consider the substantive measure, S. 2414.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with this resolution, in that case.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution removes any doubt regarding congressional intent on the effective date of S. 2414. The concurrent resolution clarifies that the effective date for S. 2414 is the same as the law which it amends. S. 2414 amends current law, Public Law 99-308 which President Reagan signed on May 19, 1986, and which becomes effective 180 days later.

I believe that this result is essential because without the adoption of this concurrent resolution, S. 2414 has no scope in which to operate without the same effective date as Public Law 99-308. I am grateful to all persons who have worked earnestly to clarify this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 152

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2414), to amend title 18 of the United States Code, shall make the following change:

At the end of the bill add the following:

This Act and the amendments made by this Act, intended to amend the Firearms Owners' Protection Act, shall become effective on the date on which the section they are intended to amend in such Firearms Owners' Protection Act becomes effective and shall apply to the amendments to title 18, United States Code, made by such Act.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1986, AND THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1986, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit tomorrow, June 25, 1986 and Thursday, June 26, 1986 during proceedings of the House under the 5-minute rule.

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

There was no objection.

## RELATING TO INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF FIREARMS

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2414) to amend title 18, United States Code, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions regarding the interpretation of various provisions in this bill. Would a member of the Subcommittee on Crime, which has jurisdiction over the firearms issue, be willing to engage in a colloquy regarding the meaning of certain terms in S. 2414?

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to join with the gentleman in a colloquy in this important issue. As the gentleman from Montana knows, this measure was processed swiftly in the other body, and there is presently a dearth of information regarding congressional intent. So what are the gentleman's concerns? I will be glad to try to respond.

Mr. MARLENEE. Well, first, I have an issue that is relevant to the new law, Public Law 99-308 (S. 49), which the President just signed, as well as S. 2414, which is before us today. Both S. 2414 and Public Law 99-308 provide for persons wishing to travel with firearms in interstate commerce. The new law, which would be further amended by S. 2414, provides that if the firearm is unloaded and inaccessible, a person can travel through State and local jurisdictions with more restrictive laws than his State of residence, without violating those laws. Is the correct?

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is correct. S. 2414 would modify the new law to require that the firearm be kept in a locked compartment, such as a trunk, outside of the passenger area. If there is no trunk, then the firearm must be in a locked compartment or in a locked case within the passenger area, but the glove compartment or a console will not suffice.

This section, however, is only available to persons who can legally own and transport firearms under the law of their home jurisdictions. People must comply with the laws of their own State and can avail themselves of this interest tranportation provision, which is section 926A of title 18 of the United States Code, only after they leave the boundaries of their State or local jurisdiction.

Mr. MARLENEE. If the gentleman will yield further, are interstate travelers required to follow the procedures in section 926A whenever they travel in interstate commerce with firearms?

Mr. McCOLLUM. This provision is designed to be a "safe harbor" for interstate travelers. No one is required to follow the procedures set forth in

section 926A, but any traveler who does cannot be convicted of violating a more restrictive State or local law in any jurisdiction through which he travels. Thus, section 926A will be valuable to the person who either knows he will be traveling through a jurisdiction with restrictive laws or is unfamiliar with the various laws of the jurisdiction he will be traversing. Many times people traveling in interstate commerce can unwittingly find themselves in violation of all kinds of technical requirements for possession of firearms. These laws and ordinances vary considerably.

Mr. MARLENEE. If the gentleman will yield further on his reservation of objection, many of my constituents farm or ranch on land in two or three different States. They travel with firearms because of their need to protect both themselves and their livestock from predators. Do these farmers and ranchers have to comply with the requirements of section 926A as set forth in either S. 2414 or the new Public Law 99-308 if they can legally travel now in and out of several States with loaded firearms on their racks in the passenger compartments of their pickup trucks?

Mr. McCOLLUM. Absolutely not. If these farmers are transporting in this manner legally now, they are not affected by the new section 926A.

Mr. MARLENEE. If the gentleman will yield further, I have an additional concern regarding the use of the word "carry" in the amendments of section 926A in S. 2414. What does the phrase "any person who is not otherwise prohibited by this chapter from transporting, shipping or receiving a firearm shall be entitled to transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where he may lawfully possess and carry such firearm"?

Mr. McCOLLUM. The first phrase means that only persons able to lawfully possess firearms under Federal law can utilize the safe harbor provisions in 926A to transport firearms in interstate commerce for lawful purposes. The phrase you highlight also requires that persons must be allowed to "possess and carry" such firearms under his own State law too. The term "carry" is defined in my 1976 version of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, as "1: to move while supporting (as a package)." The term carry in this instance is intended to mean the ability to put the firearm in a vehicle and transport it to the place of destination.

Whatever State and local laws exist regarding transportation at the place of origin of the interstate travel must be satisfied by the person utilizing the safe harbor in section 926A. Further, the use of the word "carry" is not intended to mean and does not mean that a State license to carry a concealed weapon is a predicate to valid use of the safe harbor provision in section 926A, unless a permit to carry a concealed firearm is a prerequisite to legal transportation of an unloaded, inaccessible firearm in a given jurisdiction. The safe harbor provision itself does not modify the State or local laws at the place of origin or the jurisdiction where the trip ends in any way. Any traveler utilizing the safe harbor provisions must comply with the laws of his State of origin as well as the laws of the jurisdiction at his trip's end.

I thank the gentleman for making these clarifications.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority Member for the opportunity to clarify this under a colloquy under the gentleman's reservation.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue my reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us today is an important law enforcement initiative. S. 2414, which we affectionately refer to as "son of gun," is an outgrowth of the tremendously complex Firearm Owner's Protection Act, which the President signed into law on May 19, 1986. The Senate, after adopting S. 49, but as part of its negotiations on that bill, also adopted S. 2414 to address three concerns raised by the law enforcement community.

First, son of gun clarifies the "safe harbor" provision for interstate travel with firearms. S. 2414 clarifies that the firearm must be in a locked compartment other than the passenger area, such as the trunk. If there is no trunk, then the firearm and ammunition must be in a locked compartment within the passenger area that is not the glove compartment or the console.

Second, son of gun amends the new law to delete a proof of profit motive in the definition of the term "engaged in the business" of dealing firearms for persons providing weapons for criminal purposes or terrorism.

Finally, son of gun requires dealers to maintain records of sales of firearms from their personal collections that are similar to the bound volume records they now keep for their business inventories. This provision will be of invaluable assistance to law enforcement in the effort to trace firearms used in crime.

S. 2414 is responsive to important law enforcement concerns. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the other body is to be commended for his fine and brave effort in forging this bill. The National Rifle Association has no ojection to S. 2414, and I am very pleased to see the spark of cooperation between the law enforcement community and the NRA, which son of gun represents. There is a long history of friendship and cooperation between these groups. Perhaps son of gun signals the end of a damp and dingy period in this relationship.

I urge the adoption of S. 2414.

With this statement, I insert a letter from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS,
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. BILL McCOLLUM,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. McCOLLUM: This is to comment on the proposed amendment to 18 U.S.C. § 926A which appears in S. 2414 pending in the House. Specifically, we would address the concern relative to the term "carry" as used in the bill.

In substance, this amendment would provide that, notwithstanding State or local law, a person may transport a firearm from one place to another if the person's possession and carrying of the firearm is lawful at the place of origin and destination. The bill also requires that the firearm be unloaded and inaccessible.

As we interpret the proposed amendment to section 926A, the use of the term "carry" means that the person's transportation of a firearm pursuant to the statute complies with State and local law concerning the carrying of firearms at the place of origin and destination. Thus, a State permit requirement for carrying a concealed weapon on or about the person, *e.g.*, where the weapon is accessible to the person, would not be applicable to the person lawfully transporting a firearm under the proposed amendment.

Furthermore, the term "carry" does not mean that a State or local license or permit to carry a firearm is a prerequisite to a person's right to transport firearms under the bill. In other words, the proposed amendment would create no Federal requirement relative to obtaining any State or local license or permit. On the other hand, it would not preclude a State or locality's right to regulate the carrying of firearms by its residents.

Please advise if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,
PHILLIP C. McGUIRE,
*Acting Director.*

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished chairman of this committee, I would like to compliment the gentleman on the hard work that has gone into all of this. We have struggled here mightily for legislation before and this is finally bringing to fruition the efforts the gentleman has made.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for those very kind remarks. I have enjoyed working with the gentleman on this very tough and controversial issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, if I could, under the reservation, take some time to explain what it does do.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are now considering completes congressional

action on S. 49, the Firearms Owners Protection Act of 1986. That bill passed the House on April 10. The other body passed the bill on May 6 with the House amendments. At that time, a second bill, S. 2414, passed the other body unanimously which would correct a couple of major concerns of the law enforcement community concerning S. 49, now Public Law 99-308.

As Members recall, S. 49 created a provision allowing for the interstate transportation of firearms in interstate commerce notwithstanding State or local laws. While the purpose which everyone supported was to allow travelers who lawfully possessed weapons to travel to hunting grounds in other States as drafted, it effectively preempted State and local law as it applied to residents of that State or local jurisdiction if the person was traveling "in interstate commerce" even if their possession of the firearm was in violation of the law or State in which they lived.

S. 2414 amends the interstate transportation provision to eliminate that particular result. It makes clear that one is only entitled to take advantage of this Federal preemption if the possession is lawful where the traveler starts and is lawful in the destination State.

It is also designed to protect law enforcement officers who may be making traffic stops by requiring that the weapon be unloaded and clarifying that it not be readily accessible.

The second provision of S. 2414 addresses a problem in the definition of "engaged in business" as it applies to firearms dealers. One who is in the business of dealing in firearms must have a license and record the firearms transactions. One is engaged in the business if, among other things, a person's transactions in firearms are with the principal objective of livelihood and profit.

It has been recognized that a person could have the objective of aiding a terrorist or criminal gang, for example, and not have an objective of profit and escape from the licensing and recordkeeping requirements of the law under this provision, even if one were engaged in an enormous volume of transactions. The second provision, therefore, eliminates this oversight.

The third provision of S. 2414 addresses one of the major potential threats to the integrity of law enforcement's Firearms Tracing Program. The program that saw us trace the Hinckley handgun in some 16 minutes.

S. 49 allows licensed dealers to sell firearms from their personal collections without completing the forms and maintaining the records required by sales from their inventories. That exception would result in sales for which no record at all would be maintained. In order for the law enforcement Firearm Tracing Program to operate, some minimal level of recordkeeping is required. Otherwise, we will not have tracing capability. This provision simply requires that a bound volume be maintained by the dealer of the sales of firearms which would include a complete description of the firearm, including its manufacturer, model number, and its serial number and the verified name, address, and date of birth of the purchaser. This is only a minimal inconvenience for the dealer, yet obtaining and recording this information is critical to avoid serious damage to the Firearm Tracing Program.

As the gentleman from Florida knows, we solve literally thousands and thousands of crimes every year because of our ability to trace a handgun used in the commission of a crime. For instance, somebody is stopped on the beltway and a police officer, seeing under the seat a weapon, it is traced to a burglary in Virginia, and we have a prime suspect for the burglary. We can only do that, however, through handgun tracing capability. These provisions passed the other body unanimously having been developed by Senators THURMOND, MCCLURE, HATCH, and METZENBAUM. They are important provisions and they are noncontroversial. I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving my right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With the indulgence of the Members, the Chair is constrained to intervene. The understanding was that this item would be disposed of quickly, and the Appropriations Committee has been waiting patiently.

If there is going to be an objection, the Chair would appreciate knowing it so we could expedite the business which has to be taken care of.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I would inform the Chair that this gentleman is not likely and does not plan to object but one of the other members of the committee and subcommittee has asked to inquire on something and I would certainly appreciate just a moment to yield.

I do not know what the gentleman wishes to inquire about.

Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN].

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me under his reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address the Chair and say that I support this "Son of Gun" bill that is before us. It moves us slightly in the direction of the law enforcement considerations that some of us voiced on the floor when the original bill was before us. Even though it does not solve all of those considerations that some of us had, it is a good faith step in that direction.

I, for one, who supported the amendments that were presented on the floor do support this as a reasonable amelioration of the concerns that were expressed by law enforcement and others at that time. I support it very strongly.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2414

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

SECTION 1. (a) Strike out section 926A of title 18, United States Code, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

**"§ 926A. Interstate transportation of firearms**

"Notwithstanding any other provision of any law or any rule or regulation of a State or any political subdivision thereof, any person who is not otherwise prohibited by this chapter from transporting, shipping, or receiving a firearm shall be entitled to transport a firearm for any lawful purpose from any place where he may lawfully possess and carry such firearm to any other place where he may lawfully possess and carry such firearm if, during such transportation the firearm is unloaded, and neither the firearm nor any ammunition being transported is readily accessible or directly accessible from the passenger compartment of such transporting vehicle: *provided* that in the case of a vehicle without a compartment separate from the driver's compartment the firearm or ammunition shall be contained in a locked container other than the glove compartment or console.

(b) Section 921(a)(22) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That proof of profit shall not be required as to a person who engages in the regular and repetitive purchase and disposition of firearms for criminal purposes or terrorism. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'terrorism' means activity, directed against United States persons, which—

"(A) is committed by an individual who is not a national or permanent resident alien of the United States;

"(B) involves violent acts or acts dangerous to human life which would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States; and

"(C) is intended—

"(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

"(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

"(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping".

(c) Section 923(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that any licensed manufacturer, importer, or dealer who has maintained a firearm as part of a personal collection for one year and who sells or otherwise disposes of such firearm shall record the description of the firearm in a bound volume, containing the name and place of residence and date of birth of the transferee if the transferee is an individual, or the identity and principal and local places of business of the transfer-

ee if the transferee is a corporation or other business entity; *Provided*, That no other recordkeeping shall be required.".

The Senate bill 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.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it has recently come to my attention that on rollcall No. 458, on December 12, 1985, as printed in the RECORD on page 11946, I am recorded as voting "no" on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] in support of the Armenian genocide resolution.

Mr. Speaker, my negative vote was cast under a misapprehension. I came on the floor just as the voting began, and I was not entirely clear which particular amendment was being voted on. In the confusion I got the impression that a "no" vote would support the Ford amendment, which was in error.

At the end of the voting, the committee rose; so there was no time for me to put a statement in the RECORD to correct my mistaken vote. In fact, no further discussion of the Armenian genocide issue was held in the House during the remainder of 1985.

However, my strong support of the Ford position was reflected earlier in my "yea" vote on rollcall No. 457 which made it possible for the House to consider the "Man's Inhumanity to Man" resolution.

I regret the failure to make this clarification of the issue earlier.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on the bill, H.R. 4515, as well as Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may be allowed to include extraneous and tabular matter.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4515, URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1986

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4515) making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 19, 1986.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, today I bring before the House the conference report on the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for 1986, H.R. 4515. Your conferees worked long and hard to bring before you a good compromise, one that we believe deserves your support.

| | |
|---|---|
| President's request | $7,721,965,000 |
| House passed | 1,679,485,000 |
| Senate passed | 3,874,472,000 |
| Conference agreement | 1,698,120,000 |

### BACKGROUND

This urgent supplemental appropriations bill started in the House on March 12 as H.R. 4380, a bill which I introduced to meet the urgently needed items which we face. That bill provided $449 million for emergency disaster relief and several other urgently needed items.

This bill (H.R. 4380) was considered by the full committee on March 20. When it became apparent that additional funding was needed for the Internal Revenue Service, the Customs Service, and Embassy security, and that these and other items would probably be added by the Senate, various amendments were offered which were considered essential. As a result of these actions, both the size and scope of the original bill which I introduced was increased from $449 million to $1,705 million. The bill as amended was reported to the House as original legislation—H.R. 4515.

The House of Representatives passed this measure on May 8 and the Senate passed the bill on June 6. The conferees were faced with a long and difficult situation, the other body added some 224 amendments to the House passed measure. The effect of the Senate action was to add $2,194,987,000 to the House passed bill, more than doubling the cost of the House provisions. The conference met for 6 days and involved 11 of the 13 subcommittees of appropriations. Finally, late last week we were able to reach agreement and file a conference report which I bring before this body today.

### AGREEMENT WITH THE ADMINISTRATION

In discussions with the Office of Management and Budget and with the Secretary of the Treasury, there were three matters in conference that were of serious concern and that were said would likely lead to a veto.

On the first item regarding deferrals, the point was made that while the House deferral language was intended to be temporary, it would take a change in the law to repeal the suspension. In view of the strong objections of the administration the conferees agreed to withdraw that provision in the House bill based on the assurance by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that policy deferrals would not be used for the remainder of the calendar year prior to January 1, 1987.

The second item dealt with the Senate amendment on Trade Adjustment Assistance. The administration raised a strong objection to the Senate language, and after lengthy consideration the Senate conferees agreed to recede from their insistence on the provision.

The final provision was the REA refinancing language. Here the executive branch insisted that the following new language be added: "unless in such individual case, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, to prepay would adversely affect the operation of the Federal Financing Bank."

We are prepared to agree with their language in an effort to prevent a veto which would be disastrous with regard to the many programs which are involved in this bill.

### NEED FOR URGENT ACTION

I would like to call attention to the fact that we must act on this legislation today so that the Senate may pass it and we can send it on to the White House before the Fourth of July recess. This bill includes much needed funding for the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Internal Revenue Service, the Air Traffic Control System, disaster assistance, forest fire fighting funds, veterans' compensation and pensions, student financial assistance, economic, and military assistance to the Philippines.

### RELATIONSHIP TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

The conference agreement on the urgent supplemental appropriations bill provides new budget authority—net—of $1,698,120,000 which is $6,023,845,000 below the amount requested by the administration. The conference agreement provides new discretionary budget authority of $1,122,930,000 which is $225,810,000 below the applicable section 302 allocation for fiscal year 1986 contained in the budget resolution.

I want to stress that both the bill which the House considered and passed and the conference agreement which I bring before you today are under the budget allocation given to this committee pursuant to the conference agreement on the fiscal year 1986 budget resolution. It has been pointed out to me that in the scorekeeping report to the Speaker submitted by

the House Budget Committee, that our Committee on Appropriations is under its allocation for fiscal year 1986.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the historical record of the Appropriations Committee. Even after you account for the effect of this conference agreement, we are still under our budget allocation. This must be clearly understood in this era of fiscal restraint.

FARM SITUATION

May I tell my colleagues that the farm picture is terrible as viewed from the Appropriations Committee. It was our belief, as you know, that the American farmer should get a fair price from the purchaser of his products. On two occasions the House supported our view that we should use every law in the books which permit the selling of commodities surplus to domestic need for what they will bring in world trade at competitive prices as does every other country.

We did this in the Continuing Resolution, H.J. Res. 465, which passed the House on December 4, 1985, by a vote of 212 to 208. The provision died in conference with the Senate.

On February 28, 1985, we passed H.R. 1189 which would have aided the farmer by providing additional operating loans and the refinancing of existing debt. That bill is still pending in the Senate.

It appears now that there seems to be no limit to the expenses and the costs in order to have the farmer sell below the cost of production so we will have a low domestic price. There is hardly any limit on the drain on the Treasury. This year the Congress has appropriated $25 billion—all to keep the farmers from getting a fair price from the user of his production.

At the same time, agriculture is our biggest industry and the biggest employer in our country. If agriculture goes under in all likelihood, it will pull the whole economy down.

We are greatly disturbed about this failure to allow the farmer a fair price at the marketplace and the failure to be competitive in world trade. It is a continuation of the PIK Program idea which cost an estimated $12 billion and resulted in 11 percent of our agricultural markets being transferred to our competitors because they expanded their production and expanded their exports by 11 percent.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Speaker, in the agriculture chapter we have provided for a number of items that are urgently required.

We have provided the funds to keep the Commodity Credit Corporation operating for the rest of the year. I would point out that we have provided the full amount of the request we received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Also included in our agreement are funds to meet needs resulting from a number of flood and other natural disasters that have occurred this year in a number of the Western States and in Mississippi and West Virginia.

The agreement includes funds for the WIC Program since a number of States are short of money and having to drop participants from the program.

We provided for both the Dairy Indemnity Program and the Avian Influenza Program.

We have also included language to allow the Rural Electrification Administration borrowers to prepay their loans with the Federal Financing Bank, if certain conditions are met.

The Senate added a provision which allows farmers to keep their advance deficiency payments if they are prevented from planting their crop because of floods, heavy rain, or excessive moisture. We expanded the amendment to cover droughts and we also provided that such sums received shall be deducted from crop insurance indemnity payments due as as result of such disasters.

We also provided additional funds for the Elderly Feeding Program which is running short of funds to pay claims.

COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 308 OF THE BUDGET ACT

The Congressional Budget Act, as amended by the Gramm-Rudman law, requires that each committee that files a conference report make certain material available to the membership "as soon as practicable prior to the consideration of such conference report." In compliance with this requirement, I will insert in the RECORD at this time the material required by section 308 of the Budget Act:

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H.R. 4515, URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1986, COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

Section 308(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, requires that the conference report accompanying a bill providing new budget authority contain a statement detailing how the authority compares with the reports submitted under section 302 of the act for the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year. This information follows:

COMPARISON WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

[In millions of dollars]

| | Budget authority | | Outlays | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Sec. 302(b) | To date [1] | Sec. 302(b) | To date [1] |
| Agriculture, rural development and related agencies: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 48,254 | 48,254 | 20,800 | 18,798 |
| Mandatory | 4,506 | 4,506 | 6,220 | 6,221 |
| Total | 52,760 | 52,760 | 27,020 | 25,019 |
| Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 12,467 | 12,467 | 9,280 | 9,257 |
| Mandatory | 289 | 289 | 3,050 | 3,147 |
| Total | 12,756 | 12,756 | 12,330 | 12,404 |
| Defense: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 280,719 | 280,719 | 153,076 | 158,000 |
| Mandatory | 823 | 823 | 94,100 | 93,877 |
| Total | 281,543 | 281,543 | 247,176 | 251,877 |
| District of Columbia: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 547 | 547 | 540 | 547 |
| Mandatory | | | | |
| Total | 547 | 547 | 540 | 547 |
| Energy and water development: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 15,339 | 15,339 | 8,320 | 8,258 |
| Mandatory | 1 | 1 | 7,400 | 7,408 |
| Total | 15,340 | 15,340 | 15,720 | 15,666 |
| Foreign assistance: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 14,714 | 14,714 | 5,800 | 6,053 |
| Mandatory | 43 | 43 | 8,760 | 8,837 |
| Total | 14,757 | 14,757 | 14,560 | 14,890 |
| HUD-independent agencies: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 34,499 | 34,499 | 19,630 | 17,453 |
| Mandatory | 19,658 | 19,658 | 42,108 | 44,335 |
| Total | 54,157 | 54,157 | 61,738 | 61,788 |
| Interior: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 1,392 | 1,392 | 5,600 | 5,544 |
| Mandatory | 131 | 131 | 3,500 | 4,008 |
| Total | 1,523 | 1,523 | 9,100 | 9,552 |
| Labor, Health and Human Services, Education: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 33,703 | 33,703 | 21,380 | 21,316 |
| Mandatory | 74,691 | 74,691 | 95,810 | 94,346 |
| Total | 108,393 | 108,393 | 117,190 | 115,662 |
| Legislative: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 682 | 682 | 570 | 572 |
| Mandatory | 990 | 990 | 1,180 | 1,138 |
| Total | 1,672 | 1,672 | 1,750 | 1,710 |
| Military construction: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 8,498 | 8,498 | 2,090 | 2,151 |
| Mandatory | | | 5,540 | 5,388 |
| Total | 8,498 | 8,498 | 7,630 | 7,539 |
| Transportation: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 10,216 | 10,216 | 8,750 | 8,799 |
| Mandatory | 406 | 406 | 18,370 | 18,352 |
| Total | 10,622 | 10,622 | 27,120 | 27,151 |
| Treasury-Postal Service-general government: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 7,411 | 7,411 | 6,500 | 6,595 |
| Mandatory | 6,014 | 6,014 | 6,960 | 6,467 |
| Total | 13,425 | 13,425 | 13,460 | 13,062 |
| Undistributed contingency and supplemental reserve: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 226 | 226 | −1,534 | |
| Mandatory | 287 | 287 | 960 | |
| Total | 513 | 513 | −547 | |
| Grand: | | | | |
| Discretionary | 468,667 | 468,667 | 260,802 | 263,344 |
| Mandatory | 107,838 | 107,838 | 293,958 | 293,524 |
| Total | 576,505 | 576,505 | 554,760 | 556,868 |

[1] Including conference agreement on H.R. 4515.

Note.—Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS

In compliance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following table contains 5-year projections associated with the budget authority provided in the accompanying bill:

[In thousands of dollars]

| | Budget authority | Outlays |
|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year: | | |
| 1986 | 1,698,120 | 277,440 |
| 1987 | −5,942,000 | −6,496,739 |
| 1988 | | 1,514,560 |
| 1989 | | 1,024,597 |
| 1990 and future years | | 836,766 |

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the following information was provided to the committee by the Congressional Budget Office:

The conference agreement provides:

No new spending authority as described in section 401(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344) as amended.

No revenues or tax expenditures.

Direct loan obligations of $46,700,000 and primary loan guarantee commitments of $35,814,800,000.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

In accordance with section 308(a)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344), as amended, the financial assistance to State and local government is as follows:

| | *Thousands* |
|---|---|
| New budget authority | −$6,416,415 |
| Fiscal year 1986 outlays resulting therefrom | 96,028 |

DEFERRAL AUTHORITY

The bill which passed the House included a provision which suspended the authority of the President to defer appropriated funds. Section 201 of the House bill was an emergency measure to deal with the problems caused by the CHADA decision of the Supreme Court and recent actions by the administration. The House Appropriations Committee included this language which removed the administration's authority to defer future spending under title X of the Budget Act. When this bill went over to the other body, the House provision was stricken and this became a major conference issue between the conferees and the administration. I am happy to say that I believe we have reached an accommodation that the Congress can live with and that the administration will abide by. Basically, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has pledged to the conferees, and therefore to the Congress, that he will not submit policy deferrals for the remainder of the calendar year. This will allow the courts the time to deal with the case that is pending before them on this issue. Also, I have spoken to our good friends Chairman PEPPER of the Rules Committee and Chairman BROOKS of the Government Operations Committee who are both looking into this matter. The CHADA decision affects House procedures, the withholding of appropriated funds affects the management and operations of the Government. I am hopeful that the time that we have in effect bought with this compromise will allow these committees to work out a permanent solution so that we can restore balance between the legislative and executive branch. I have told this House on numerous occasions, that we must all pull together like the three-horsed chariot if we are to move forward together.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all my House conferees who worked so hard on this difficult conference: Mr. BOLAND, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. REGULA.

To my colleagues in the House, I urge your support for this conference report. I ask for you to vote not only for this legislation, but I ask you to vote for the victims of disasters, the homeless, the farmers who have been devastated, our veterans, and most of all—our country.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the membership, I will insert at this time in the RECORD, a table which lists the various items that were in each bill and their disposition by the conferees:

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

SUPPLEMENTAL - H.R. 4515

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CHAPTER I | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE | | | | | | |
| Soil Conservation Service | | | | | | |
| Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations | --- | 25,000,000 | 36,700,000 | 36,700,000 | +11,700,000 | --- |
| Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service | | | | | | |
| Emergency Conservation Program | --- | 10,000,000 | --- | 5,000,000 | -5,000,000 | +5,000,000 |
| Agricultural Research Service | | | | | | |
| Buildings and facilities | --- | --- | 11,100,000 | --- | --- | -11,100,000 |
| Food Safety and Inspection Service | --- | 3,700,000 | 4,500,000 | 3,700,000 | --- | -800,000 |
| Packers and stockyards administration | --- | --- | 80,000 | 80,000 | +80,000 | --- |
| Farmers Home Administration | | | | | | |
| Rural Housing Insurance Fund: | | | | | | |
| (Direct loans) | (-7,000,000) | --- | (-4,480,000) | (-3,000,000) | (-3,000,000) | (+1,480,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval - D86-60) | --- | (7,000,000) | (7,000,000) | (7,000,000) | --- | --- |
| (Insured loans) | (-699,000,000) | --- | (1,500,000) | (1,000,000) | (+1,000,000) | (-500,000) |
| (Deferral disappproval - D86-60) | --- | (693,000,000) | (693,000,000) | (693,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Very low income housing repair grants | --- | --- | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | +2,000,000 | -1,000,000 |
| Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation) | (71,598,000) | (71,598,000) | (71,598,000) | (71,598,000) | --- | --- |
| Dairy indemnity program | 6,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 9,000,000 | 9,000,000 | -1,000,000 | --- |
| DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| Food and Nutrition Service | | | | | | |
| Feeding program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC) | --- | 20,000,000 | --- | 20,000,000 | --- | +20,000,000 |
| Commodity Supplemental Food Program | | | | | | |
| (Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation) | --- | (3,950,000) | (3,950,000) | (3,950,000) | --- | --- |
| Food Donations Program | | | | | | |
| Elderly feeding programs (by transfer) | --- | --- | (8,500,000) | --- | --- | (-8,500,000) |
| Elderly feeding programs (direct appropriatons) | --- | --- | --- | 8,500,000 | +8,500,000 | +8,500,000 |
| Temporary emergency food assistance progam (by transfer) | --- | --- | (2,440,000) | --- | --- | (-2,440,000) |
| Temporary emergency food assistance progam (direct appropriations) | --- | --- | --- | 2,437,000 | +2,437,000 | +2,437,000 |
| Commodity Credit Corporation | | | | | | |
| Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: | | | | | | |
| Citrus Canker (by transfer) | --- | (14,000,000) | --- | (11,100,000) | (-2,900,000) | (+11,100,000) |
| Cooperative State Research Service (by transfer) | --- | (5,000,000) | --- | (5,000,000) | --- | (+5,000,000) |
| Avian Influenza (by transfer) | --- | (10,000,000) | --- | (5,000,000) | (-5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| Reimbursement for net realized losses 1/ | 5,300,000,000 | --- | 5,300,000,000 | 5,300,000,000 | +5,300,000,000 | --- |
| External combustion engines | --- | --- | (4,000,000) | --- | --- | (-4,000,000) |
| Total, Chapter I: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 5,306,000,000 | 68,700,000 | 5,364,380,000 | 5,387,417,000 | +5,318,717,000 | +23,037,000 |
| (By transfer) | (71,598,000) | (104,548,000) | (86,488,000) | (96,648,000) | (-7,900,000) | (+10,160,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (-706,000,000) | --- | (-2,980,000) | (-2,000,000) | (-2,000,000) | (+980,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (700,000,000) | (700,000,000) | (700,000,000) | --- | --- |

1/ Requested as a permanent indefinite appropriation.

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CHAPTER II | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE | | | | | | |
| Economic Development Administration | | | | | | |
| Economic development assistance programs (deferral disapproval - D86-36) | --- | (40,000,000) | (40,000,000) | (40,000,000) | --- | --- |
| National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations, research and facilities | --- | --- | 10,822,000 | 10,822,000 | +10,822,000 | --- |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | | | | | |
| Legal Activities | | | | | | |
| United States Marshals Service | --- | --- | 2,600,000 | 2,600,000 | +2,600,000 | --- |
| (By transfer) | (2,600,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Support of United States prisoners | --- | --- | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | +3,000,000 | --- |
| Federal Bureau of Investigation | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | +10,000,000 | --- |
| (Rescission) | --- | --- | -10,000,000 | -10,000,000 | -10,000,000 | --- |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | +3,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer) | (3,000,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Federal Prison System | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 10,620,000 | 15,500,000 | 18,000,000 | 18,000,000 | +2,500,000 | --- |
| (By transfer) | (2,500,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Institute of Corrections (rescission) | --- | --- | -3,315,000 | --- | --- | +3,315,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE | | | | | | |
| Administration of Foreign Affairs | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 228,494,000 | --- | 288,047,000 | 283,104,000 | +283,104,000 | -4,943,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (237,494,000) | --- | --- | (-237,494,000) | --- |
| Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad | 454,532,000 | --- | 372,125,000 | 409,000,000 | +409,000,000 | +36,875,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (454,532,000) | --- | --- | (-454,532,000) | --- |
| Counterterrorism research and development | 10,000,000 | --- | --- | 10,000,000 | +10,000,000 | +10,000,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | (10,000,000) | --- | --- | (-10,000,000) | --- |
| Total, Administration of foreign affairs | 693,026,000 | --- | 660,172,000 | 702,104,000 | +702,104,000 | +41,932,000 |
| Other | | | | | | |
| The Asia Foundation | --- | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of State | 693,026,000 | 2,000,000 | 662,172,000 | 704,104,000 | +702,104,000 | +41,932,000 |
| THE JUDICIARY | | | | | | |
| Supreme Court of the United States | | | | | | |
| Care of the building and grounds | 46,000 | 46,000 | 46,000 | 46,000 | --- | --- |
| Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services | | | | | | |
| Salaries of supporting personnel | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries of supporting personnel (by transfer) | (12,000,000) | (12,000,000) | --- | --- | (-12,000,000) | --- |
| Fees of jurors and commissioners | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 | 3,800,000 | --- | --- |
| Study of construction of office building | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,300,000 | 1,300,000 | -700,000 | --- |
| Space and facilities | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | 6,300,000 | 6,300,000 | -700,000 | --- |
| Total, The Judiciary | 7,046,000 | 7,046,000 | 6,346,000 | 6,346,000 | -700,000 | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Department of Transportation | | | | | | |
| Maritime Administration | | | | | | |
| Operations and training (deferral disapproval-D86-53). | --- | (9,350,000) | (1,738,000) | (1,738,000) | (-7,612,000) | --- |
| Board for International Broadcasting | | | | | | |
| Grants and expenses | 22,000,000 | 14,500,000 | 18,800,000 | 18,800,000 | +4,300,000 | --- |
| Small Business Administration | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer) | --- | (2,000,000) | (2,000,000) | (2,000,000) | --- | --- |
| United States Information Agency | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 17,326,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (3,900,000) | (3,900,000) | (+3,900,000) | --- |
| Total, Chapter II: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 750,018,000 | 39,046,000 | 721,425,000 | 766,672,000 | +727,626,000 | +45,247,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (750,018,000) | (39,046,000) | (734,740,000) | (776,672,000) | (+737,626,000) | (+41,932,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | --- | (-13,315,000) | (-10,000,000) | (-10,000,000) | (+3,315,000) |
| (By transfer) | (20,100,000) | (716,026,000) | (5,900,000) | (5,900,000) | (-710,126,000) | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (49,350,000) | (41,738,000) | (41,738,000) | (-7,612,000) | --- |
| CHAPTER III | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY | | | | | | |
| OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | | | | | | |
| Tenth International Pan American Games | --- | --- | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | +8,000,000 | --- |
| (Rescission) | --- | --- | -8,000,000 | -8,000,000 | -8,000,000 | --- |
| PROCUREMENT | | | | | | |
| Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (rescission) | (-34,400,000) | --- | -34,400,000 | -34,400,000 | -34,400,000 | --- |
| Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (rescission) | (-40,100,000) | --- | -40,100,000 | -40,100,000 | -40,100,000 | --- |
| Missile Procurement, Air Force (by transfer) | --- | --- | (345,400,000) | (345,400,000) | (+345,400,000) | --- |
| Other Procurement, Air Force (rescission) | (-40,000,000) | --- | -40,000,000 | -40,000,000 | -40,000,000 | --- |
| RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION | | | | | | |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (by transfer) | --- | --- | (316,886,000) | (316,886,000) | (+316,886,000) | --- |
| (Rescission) | --- | --- | -13,500,000 | --- | --- | +13,500,000 |
| Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Agencies (rescission) | --- | --- | -11,100,000 | --- | --- | +11,100,000 |
| REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS | | | | | | |
| ADP Equipment Management Fund | --- | --- | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | +100,000,000 | --- |
| (Rescission) | --- | --- | -100,000,000 | -100,000,000 | -100,000,000 | --- |
| Total, Chapter III: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | --- | --- | -139,100,000 | -114,500,000 | -114,500,000 | +24,600,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | --- | --- | (108,000,000) | (108,000,000) | (+108,000,000) | --- |
| Rescissions | (-114,500,000) | --- | (-247,100,000) | (-222,500,000) | (-222,500,000) | (+24,600,000) |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (662,286,000) | (662,286,000) | (+662,286,000) | --- |
| CHAPTER IV | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL | | | | | | |
| Department of the Army | | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers - Civil | | | | | | |
| Flood control and coastal emergencies | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | +25,000,000 |
| General expenses (by transfer) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Department of Defense - Civil | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | +25,000,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY | | | | | | |
| Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities | | | | | | |
| (Deferral disapproval - D86-38) | --- | (23,156,000) | (23,156,000) | (23,156,000) | --- | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Atomic Energy Defense Activities** | | | | | | |
| (Transfer from Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies) | (62,000,000) | (62,000,000) | --- | (62,000,000) | --- | (+62,000,000) |
| Total, Chapter IV: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | 25,000,000 | --- | +25,000,000 |
| (By transfer) | (65,000,000) | (65,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (65,000,000) | --- | (+62,000,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (23,156,000) | (23,156,000) | (23,156,000) | --- | --- |
| **CHAPTER V** | | | | | | |
| **FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| **Bilateral Economic Assistance** | | | | | | |
| **Agency for International Development** | | | | | | |
| Economic support fund | 100,000,000 | --- | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | +100,000,000 | --- |
| (By transfer) | --- | (50,000,000) | --- | --- | (-50,000,000) | --- |
| International Fund for Northern Ireland and Ireland | 20,000,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (20,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (+50,000,000) | (+30,000,000) |
| **Foreign Assistance Contingencies** | | | | | | |
| General contingencies | 50,000,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Department of State** | | | | | | |
| Anti-terrorism assistance | 4,840,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (2,739,000) | (2,739,000) | (+2,739,000) | --- |
| **Military Assistance** | | | | | | |
| Military assistance | 50,000,000 | --- | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | +50,000,000 | --- |
| Reappropriation | 15,000,000 | --- | 15,000,000 | --- | --- | -15,000,000 |
| (By transfer) | (14,355,000) | --- | (14,355,000) | --- | --- | (-14,355,000) |
| Total, Chapter V: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 239,840,000 | --- | 165,000,000 | 150,000,000 | +150,000,000 | -15,000,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (224,840,000) | --- | (150,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (+150,000,000) | --- |
| Reappropriation | (15,000,000) | --- | (15,000,000) | --- | --- | (-15,000,000) |
| (By transfer) | (14,355,000) | (50,000,000) | (37,094,000) | (52,739,000) | (+2,739,000) | (+15,645,000) |
| **CHAPTER VI** | | | | | | |
| **DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT** | | | | | | |
| **HOUSING PROGRAMS** | | | | | | |
| Annual contributions for assisted housing (deferral disapproval - D86-41) | --- | (2,300,805,000) | (2,300,805,000) | (2,300,805,000) | --- | --- |
| Rescission in FY 1986 | --- | --- | -3,000,000,000 | -5,250,000,000 | -5,250,000,000 | -2,250,000,000 |
| Rescission in FY 1987 | --- | --- | --- | -6,042,000,000 | -6,042,000,000 | -6,042,000,000 |
| Rent supplement (rescission of contract authority, indefinite) | (-1,158,920,000) | --- | -1,158,920,000 | -1,158,920,000 | -1,158,920,000 | --- |
| (Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) | (-41,390,000) | --- | (-41,390,000) | (-41,390,000) | (-41,390,000) | --- |
| Rental housing assistance (rescission of contract authority, indefinite) | (-283,584,000) | --- | -283,584,000 | -283,584,000 | -283,584,000 | --- |
| (Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) | (-10,128,000) | --- | (-10,128,000) | (-10,128,000) | (-10,128,000) | --- |
| Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund (deferral disapproval - D86-45) | --- | (530,220,000) | (530,220,000) | (530,220,000) | --- | --- |
| Nonprofit sponsor assistance (deferral disapproval D86-46) | --- | (457,000) | (457,000) | (457,000) | --- | --- |
| **Federal Housing Administration Fund** | | | | | | |
| Federal Housing Administration Fund (limitation on guaranteed loans) | (6,500,000,000) | --- | (57,580,000,000) | (57,580,000,000) | (+57,580,000,000) | --- |
| **Government National Mortgage Association** | | | | | | |
| Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities (limitation on guaranteed loans) | --- | --- | (49,000,000,000) | (49,000,000,000) | (+49,000,000,000) | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | |
| Community development grants (deferral disapproval D86-48) | --- | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Rehabilitation loan fund (deferral disapproval D86-50) | --- | (131,133,000) | (131,133,000) | (131,133,000) | --- | --- |
| MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer) | (10,100,000) | (23,701,000) | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (+6,299,000) | --- |
| INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 1,553,000 | 1,553,000 | --- | 1,553,000 | --- | +1,553,000 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer) | --- | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | (3,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Construction Grants (release of appropriated funds) | --- | --- | (600,000,000) | (1,200,000,000) | (+1,200,000,000) | (+600,000,000) |
| FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY | | | | | | |
| Disaster relief | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | 250,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer) | --- | (2,920,000) | (2,920,000) | (2,920,000) | --- | --- |
| NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Research and development (by transfer) | --- | --- | --- | (5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| Space flight, control and data communications | --- | --- | 526,000,000 | 431,000,000 | +431,000,000 | -95,000,000 |
| Advance appropriation in FY 1987 | --- | --- | --- | 100,000,000 | +100,000,000 | +100,000,000 |
| Research and program management (by transfer) | --- | (38,100,000) | (38,100,000) | (38,100,000) | --- | --- |
| VETERANS ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Compensation and pensions | 272,000,000 | 272,000,000 | 272,000,000 | 272,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Readjustment benefits | 91,000,000 | 91,000,000 | 91,000,000 | 91,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Medical care (by transfer) | --- | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | (30,000,000) | --- | --- |
| General operating expenses (by transfer) | --- | (6,000,000) | (6,000,000) | (6,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Veterans job training (by transfer) | --- | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Veterans Administration | 363,000,000 | 363,000,000 | 363,000,000 | 363,000,000 | --- | --- |
| CORPORATIONS | | | | | | |
| Federal Home Loan Bank Board: | | | | | | |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Chapter VI: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority, FY 1986 | 614,553,000 | 614,553,000 | -3,303,504,000 | -5,646,951,000 | -6,261,504,000 | -2,343,447,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (614,553,000) | (614,553,000) | (1,139,000,000) | (1,045,553,000) | (+431,000,000) | (-93,447,000) |
| Rescissions | (-1,442,504,000) | --- | (-4,442,504,000) | (-6,692,504,000) | (-6,692,504,000) | (-2,250,000,000) |
| New budget (obligational) authority, FY 1987 | --- | --- | --- | -5,942,000,000 | -5,942,000,000 | -5,942,000,000 |
| Appropriations 1987 | --- | --- | --- | (100,000,000) | (+100,000,000) | (+100,000,000) |
| Rescission 1987 | --- | --- | --- | (-6,042,000,000) | (-6,042,000,000) | (-6,042,000,000) |
| (By transfer) | (10,100,000) | (138,721,000) | (145,020,000) | (150,020,000) | (+11,299,000) | (+5,000,000) |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (6,500,000,000) | --- | (106,580,000,000) | (106,580,000,000) | +106,580,000,000) | --- |
| (Limitation on annual contract authority, indfinite) | (-51,518,000) | --- | (-51,518,000) | (-51,518,000) | (-51,518,000) | --- |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (3,462,615,000) | (3,462,615,000) | (3,462,615,000) | --- | --- |
| CHAPTER VII | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR | | | | | | |
| Bureau of Land Management | | | | | | |
| Land acquisition (Rescission) | --- | --- | -3,000,000 | --- | --- | +3,000,000 |
| (Effect of new deferral) 1/ | --- | (-3,000,000) | --- | (-3,000,000) | --- | (-3,000,000) |
| United States Fish and Wildlife Service | | | | | | |
| Resource management | --- | 90,000 | --- | --- | -90,000 | --- |
| Land acquisition | --- | --- | 2,373,000 | 2,373,000 | +2,373,000 | --- |
| (Effect of new deferral) 1/ | --- | (-4,432,000) | --- | --- | (+4,432,000) | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **National Park Service** | | | | | | |
| Operation of the national park system | 13,470,000 | 13,900,000 | 13,470,000 | 13,470,000 | -430,000 | --- |
| Construction | --- | --- | 3,420,000 | 3,850,000 | +3,850,000 | +430,000 |
| Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority) | (-28,710,000) | -28,710,000 | -28,710,000 | -28,710,000 | --- | --- |
| (Effect of new deferral) | (-1,893,000) | --- | (-1,893,000) | --- | --- | (+1,893,000) |
| **Geological Survey** | | | | | | |
| Surveys, investigations and research | --- | --- | 1,400,000 | 1,400,000 | +1,400,000 | --- |
| **Minerals Management Service** | | | | | | |
| Leasing and royalty management | --- | 800,000 | --- | 200,000 | -600,000 | +200,000 |
| Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing | 800,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement** | | | | | | |
| Regulation and technology (rescission) | --- | -710,000 | --- | -210,000 | +500,000 | -210,000 |
| **Bureau of Indian Affairs** | | | | | | |
| Operation of Indian programs | 26,500,000 | 31,368,000 | 26,500,000 | 29,204,000 | -2,164,000 | +2,704,000 |
| Construction | --- | --- | 4,900,000 | 2,500,000 | +2,500,000 | -2,400,000 |
| (Effect of new deferral) | --- | --- | (-4,900,000) | (-2,500,000) | (-2,500,000) | (+2,400,000) |
| 1/ Originally proposed as rescission. | | | | | | |
| **Territorial and International Affairs** | | | | | | |
| Compact of Free Association | 178,750,000 | 178,750,000 | 210,890,000 | 210,840,000 | +32,090,000 | -50,000 |
| Total, Department of the Interior (net) | 219,520,000 | 195,488,000 | 231,243,000 | 234,917,000 | +39,429,000 | +3,674,000 |
| **RELATED AGENCIES** | | | | | | |
| **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE** | | | | | | |
| **Forest Service** | | | | | | |
| State and private forestry | --- | 161,000 | 161,000 | 161,000 | --- | --- |
| National forest system | 165,700,000 | 165,700,000 | 165,700,000 | 165,700,000 | --- | --- |
| Construction | --- | --- | 1,700,000 | 1,700,000 | +1,700,000 | --- |
| Land acquisition | --- | 4,436,000 | 4,436,000 | 4,436,000 | --- | --- |
| Timber salvage sales (deferral disapproval-D86-3) | --- | (3,153,000) | (3,153,000) | (3,153,000) | --- | --- |
| Total, Forest Service | 165,700,000 | 170,297,000 | 171,997,000 | 171,997,000 | +1,700,000 | --- |
| **DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY** | | | | | | |
| Fossil energy research and development (deferral disapproval - D86-6A) | --- | (62,205,000) | (22,541,000) | (25,871,000) | (-36,334,000) | (+3,330,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral) | --- | --- | (-2,607,000) | (-2,607,000) | (-2,607,000) | --- |
| Naval Petroleum Reserve (deferral approval-D86-8A) | --- | --- | (-36,461,000) | --- | --- | (+36,461,000) |
| Energy conservation (deferral disapproval-D86-9A) | --- | (36,782,000) | (14,906,000) | (14,826,000) | (-21,956,000) | (-80,000) |
| Strategic petroleum reserve (deferral disapproval D86-17) | --- | (197,940,825) | (41,182,000) | (41,182,000) | (-156,758,825) | --- |
| SPR petroleum account (deferral disapproval-D86-10A) | --- | (315,000,000) | (577,534,000) | (577,534,000) | (+262,534,000) | --- |
| Alternative Fuels Production | 1,020,360,322 | --- | 1,020,360,322 | 1,020,360,322 | +1,020,360,322 | --- |
| Appropriation applied to debt reduction | -1,020,360,322 | --- | -1,020,360,322 | -1,020,360,322 | -1,020,360,322 | --- |
| **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES** | | | | | | |
| **Health Resources and Services Administration** | | | | | | |
| Indian health services | --- | 20,000,000 | 1,800,000 | 13,500,000 | -6,500,000 | +11,700,000 |
| Indian health facilities (effect of new defferal) | --- | --- | (-13,745,000) | (-11,665,000) | (-11,665,000) | (+2,080,000) |
| **SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION** | | | | | | |
| **National Gallery of Art** | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses (by transfer) | --- | (136,000) | --- | (36,000) | (-100,000) | (+36,000) |
| Total, Chapter VII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority (net) | 385,220,000 | 385,785,000 | 405,040,000 | 420,414,000 | +34,629,000 | +15,374,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (1,405,580,322) | (415,205,000) | (1,457,110,322) | (1,469,694,322) | (+1,054,489,322) | (+12,584,000) |
| Appropriation applied to debt reduction | (-1,020,360,322) | --- | (-1,020,360,322) | (-1,020,360,322) | (-1,020,360,322) | --- |
| Rescissions | (-28,710,000) | (-29,420,000) | (-31,710,000) | (-28,920,000) | (+500,000) | (+2,790,000) |
| (By transfer) | --- | (136,000) | --- | (36,000) | (-100,000) | (+36,000) |
| (Deferral approval) | --- | --- | (-36,461,000) | --- | --- | (+36,461,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (615,080,825) | (659,316,000) | (662,566,000) | (+47,485,175) | (+3,250,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral) | (-1,893,000) | (-7,432,000) | (-23,145,000) | (-19,772,000) | (-12,340,000) | (+3,373,000) |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CHAPTER VIII | | | | | | |
| DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES | | | | | | |
| Health Resources and Services Administration | | | | | | |
| Health resources and services | --- | --- | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | +2,000,000 | --- |
| National Institutes of Health | | | | | | |
| National Cancer Institute | --- | 6,000,000 | --- | 6,000,000 | --- | +6,000,000 |
| Office of Community Service | | | | | | |
| Community Services Block Grant | --- | --- | 5,000,000 | 1,500,000 | +1,500,000 | -3,500,000 |
| DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION | | | | | | |
| Impact Aid | --- | 20,000,000 | --- | 20,000,000 | --- | +20,000,000 |
| Student Financial assistance | --- | --- | 146,000,000 | 146,000,000 | +146,000,000 | --- |
| RELATED AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Soldier's and Airmen's Home | | | | | | |
| Operation and maintenance (by transfer) | --- | --- | (1,241,000) | (1,241,000) | (+1,241,000) | --- |
| Total, Chapter VIII: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | --- | 26,000,000 | 153,000,000 | 175,500,000 | +149,500,000 | +22,500,000 |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (1,241,000) | (1,241,000) | (+1,241,000) | --- |
| CHAPTER IX | | | | | | |
| LEGISLATIVE BRANCH | | | | | | |
| SENATE | | | | | | |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | | |
| Administrative, clerical, and legislative assistance to Senators | 243,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Offices of the secretaries for the Majority and Minority | 80,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper | --- | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| Agency contributions | 32,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, salaries, officers and employees | 355,000 | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| Contingent Expenses of the Senate | | | | | | |
| Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate | 9,100,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous items | 650,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, contingent expenses of the Senate | 9,750,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Senate | 10,105,000 | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | | | | | | |
| Salaries, Officers and Employees | | | | | | |
| Office of the Sergeant at Arms | --- | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| Contingent Expenses of the House | | | | | | |
| Standing Committees, Special and Select | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 350,000 | 350,000 | --- | 350,000 | --- | +350,000 |
| JOINT ITEMS | | | | | | |
| Contingent Expenses of the House | | | | | | |
| Joint Committee on Taxation | 950,000 | 912,000 | 912,000 | 912,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol Police | | | | | | |
| Capitol Police Board | --- | --- | 13,000,000 | 13,000,000 | +13,000,000 | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Official Mail Costs** | | | | | | |
| Expenses | 50,499,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total, Joint items | 51,449,000 | 912,000 | 13,912,000 | 13,912,000 | +13,000,000 | --- |
| **ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL** | | | | | | |
| **Office of the Architect of the Capitol** | | | | | | |
| Salaries | --- | --- | 250,000 | 250,000 | +250,000 | --- |
| **Capitol Buildings and Grounds** | | | | | | |
| Capitol buildings | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | 8,000,000 | --- | --- |
| Capitol grounds | 7,675,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Restoration of West Front (rescission) | --- | --- | -3,683,000 | --- | --- | +3,683,000 |
| Capitol Power Plant | 2,000,000 | 1,583,000 | 1,583,000 | 1,583,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Capitol buildings and grounds | 17,675,000 | 9,583,000 | 5,900,000 | 9,583,000 | --- | +3,683,000 |
| **Library of Congress** | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 1,000,000 | 867,000 | +867,000 | -133,000 |
| Total, Chapter IX: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 79,579,000 | 10,845,000 | 22,062,000 | 25,962,000 | +15,117,000 | +3,900,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (79,579,000) | (10,845,000) | (25,745,000) | (25,962,000) | (+15,117,000) | (+217,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | --- | (-3,683,000) | --- | --- | (+3,683,000) |
| **CHAPTER X** | | | | | | |
| **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION** | | | | | | |
| **Coast Guard** | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | --- | 35,500,000 | 35,500,000 | 35,500,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer) | (35,500,000) | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Acquisition, construction and improvements (By transfer) | --- | --- | (21,250,000) | (21,250,000) | (+21,250,000) | --- |
| **Federal Aviation Administration** | | | | | | |
| Operations | 6,755,000 | 80,000,000 | 80,000,000 | 80,000,000 | --- | --- |
| (By transfer) | (73,245,000) | (5,000,000) | --- | (4,250,000) | (-750,000) | (+4,250,000) |
| Research, engineering and development (by transfer) | (72,220,000) | --- | (72,220,000) | (72,220,000) | (+72,220,000) | --- |
| **RELATED AGENCY** | | | | | | |
| **Panama Canal Commission** | | | | | | |
| Operating expenses | --- | 20,000,000 | --- | 18,300,000 | -1,700,000 | +18,300,000 |
| Total, Chapter X: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 6,755,000 | 135,500,000 | 115,500,000 | 133,800,000 | -1,700,000 | +18,300,000 |
| (By transfer) | (180,965,000) | (5,000,000) | (93,470,000) | (97,720,000) | (+92,720,000) | (+4,250,000) |
| **CHAPTER XI** | | | | | | |
| **DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY** | | | | | | |
| Departmental offices (rescission) | --- | --- | -912,000 | --- | --- | +912,000 |
| Internal Revenue Service: | | | | | | |
| Processing tax returns | 194,564,000 | 194,564,000 | 194,564,000 | 194,564,000 | --- | --- |
| Examinations and appeals | 68,706,000 | 68,706,000 | 68,706,000 | 68,706,000 | --- | --- |
| Investigations, collections and taxpayer service | 76,730,000 | 76,730,000 | 76,730,000 | 76,730,000 | --- | --- |
| Total, Internal Revenue Service | 340,000,000 | 340,000,000 | 340,000,000 | 340,000,000 | --- | --- |
| **United States Customs Service** | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | 30,831,000 | 30,831,000 | 30,831,000 | --- | --- |
| Operations and maintenance, air interdiction program | --- | 3,225,000 | --- | 3,225,000 | --- | +3,225,000 |
| Total, United States Customs Service | --- | 34,056,000 | 30,831,000 | 34,056,000 | --- | +3,225,000 |
| Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms | --- | --- | 500,000 | 500,000 | +500,000 | --- |
| Office of Personnel Management (by transfer) | --- | --- | (100,000) | (100,000) | (+100,000) | --- |

SUPPLEMENTAL

| | Supplemental Request | House | Senate | Conference | --- Conference compared with --- House | Senate |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION | | | | | | |
| Federal Buildings Fund (limitation) | --- | --- | (3,500,000) | (3,500,000) | (+3,500,000) | --- |
| Federal Retirement thrift investment fund | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | --- | --- | 250,000 | 250,000 | +250,000 | --- |
| Total, Chapter XI: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 340,000,000 | 374,056,000 | 370,669,000 | 374,806,000 | +750,000 | +4,137,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (340,000,000) | (374,056,000) | (371,581,000) | (374,806,000) | (+750,000) | (+3,225,000) |
| Rescissions | --- | --- | (-912,000) | --- | --- | (+912,000) |
| (By transfer) | --- | --- | (100,000) | (100,000) | (+100,000) | --- |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority, FY 1986 | 7,721,965,000 | 1,679,485,000 | 3,874,472,000 | 1,698,120,000 | +18,635,000 | -2,176,352,000 |
| Appropriations 1986 | (8,727,325,322) | (1,708,905,000) | (9,619,056,322) | (9,672,404,322) | (+7,963,499,322) | (+53,348,000) |
| Reappropriation | (15,000,000) | --- | (15,000,000) | --- | --- | (-15,000,000) |
| Rescissions | (-1,585,714,000) | (-29,420,000) | (-4,739,224,000) | (-6,953,924,000) | (-6,924,504,000) | (-2,214,700,000) |
| Appropriation applied to debt reduction | (-1,020,360,322) | --- | (-1,020,360,322) | (-1,020,360,322) | (-1,020,360,322) | --- |
| (Deferral approval) | --- | --- | (-36,461,000) | --- | --- | (+36,461,000) |
| (Deferral disapproval) | --- | (4,850,201,825) | (4,886,825,000) | (4,890,075,000) | (+39,873,175) | (+3,250,000) |
| (Effect of new deferral) | (-1,893,000) | (-7,432,000) | (-23,145,000) | (-19,772,000) | (-12,340,000) | (+3,373,000) |
| (By transfer) | (362,118,000) | (1,079,431,000) | (1,034,599,000) | (1,131,690,000) | (+52,259,000) | (+97,091,000) |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | (3,429,000) | --- | --- |
| (Limitation on guaranteed loans) | (6,500,000,000) | --- | (106,580,000,000) | (106,580,000,000) | +106,580,000,000) | --- |
| (Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) | (-51,518,000) | --- | (-51,518,000) | (-51,518,000) | (-51,518,000) | --- |
| (Loan authorization) | (-706,000,000) | --- | (-2,980,000) | (-2,000,000) | (-2,000,000) | (+980,000) |
| TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority, FY 1987 | --- | --- | --- | -5,942,000,000 | -5,942,000,000 | -5,942,000,000 |
| Appropriations 1987 | --- | --- | --- | (100,000,000) | (+100,000,000) | (+100,000,000) |
| Rescission 1987 | --- | --- | --- | (-6,042,000,000) | (-6,042,000,000) | (-6,042,000,000) |

□ 1650

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of one question?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's yielding. I have one very simple question that I would like to ask.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that one of the provisions of this bill of course provides $5.3 million in capital restoration for the Commodity Credit Corporation at the same time that it transfers back to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program $3.95 million that was lost earlier.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: It is my understanding that the Secretary of Agriculture may approve new Commodity Supplemental Food Program applications which are submitted by individual States, provided there are sufficient appropriations available and there is no reduction in the participation levels at existing sites. I would like to ask the chairman if that is his understanding of the Secretary's authority under this legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that we provide the full amount, $5.3 million, as I gave my assurance when we had the appointment of conferees before the House.

I will say that from accounts in the press and from the Department, the demand for money from the Treasury to make up the difference so farmers can sell below cost is just going through the ceiling. I anticipated that, and apparently it is true. But here we have every dollar that was requested by the Office of Management and Budget to meet immediate needs.

The gentleman is correct that the $3.95 million would let the Secretary approve new applications for CSFP distribution projects as long as levels at existing sites are not reduced.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's response. That is exactly the information that I was looking for.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the situation facing farmers is desperate, because we do not let the farmer get his price from the user of his product. The outlook is bleak.

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

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, contained in this conference report is some important language dealing with that portion of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Program administered by the Department of Agriculture. Specifically, the conference report provides an appropriation of $8.5 million for the elderly feeding program. The express and stated purpose of this aid is to allow the reimbursement rate provided to States to be set at 56.76 cents made retroactive to fiscal year 1985 and throughout fiscal year 1986.

The questions are, does this additional $8.5 million guarantee that USDA will honor all past dues claims for fiscal year 1985, and how much of the funds will be required for this? What would the balance be used for?

Can the chairman give any indication as to when the Department will release these funds once the President signs this bill into law?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that our provision makes it possible to carry that out. One of the things that I have learned since I have been here for a short time is that regulations come out of the administration, out of the executive branch, so we cannot assure you that claims will be paid, but we can assure you that the provisions of the bill allow those claims be paid.

Mr. BIAGGI. The money is there?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House in early May, I de-

scribed it as a mixture of good news and bad news. Thanks to a last-minute agreement with the administration, the news today is good.

We have provided urgent funding for IRS enforcement and proceeding activities, FEMA disaster relief, FAA air traffic control, the Federal Housing Administration, veterans' benefits, Pell grants, the elderly feeding program, and embassy security.

Although we are still writing agriculture legislation in appropriation bills, the most objectionable provisions were stricken by points of order in the House, or were compromised in conference. As a result, we have a conference agreement that is acceptable to the administration.

We went into conference with 224 Senate amendments, and 8 provisions that were strongly objectionable to the administration. We came out of conference with one amendment in disagreement between the House and the Senate, and with one provision in disagreement between the conferees and the administration.

We are still in disagreement with the Senate over their amendment which prohibits the IRS from implementing temporary regulations on vehicle records. There will be a separate vote on that motion.

Until about an hour ago, we were in disagreement with the administration over the Senate amendment that allows loans from the Federal Financing Bank to rural electric cooperatives to be prepaid without penalty. The conferees limited the prepayments to cases where cooperatives would realize substantial savings for their customers or avoid bankruptcy.

That language was not acceptable to the administration. Their position on REA was stated clearly before we went to conference, and I think they were right on target, the loans in question are made to cooperatives with funds borrowed from the public by the Federal Financing Bank. If the loans are prepaid without penalty by the cooperative, then the taxpayer is stuck with the interest on the FFB's original loans, which has an estimated current value between $2.4 and $3 billion.

I now understand that the Chairman will offer compromise language, acceptable to the administration, that would permit the Secretary of the Treasury to waive any particular prepayment that would adversely effect the operation of the Federal Financing Bank.

That was the only issue standing in the way of a Presidential signature. We settled all of the other seven major disagreements.

While the conference agreement disapproves over $4 billion in housing and community development deferrals, the conferees agreed to strike the House limitation on the President's deferral authority in return for an assurance from the administration that they would not submit any policy deferrals for the remainder of the calendar year.

We deleted the Senate amendment that provided trade adjustment assistance for workers in the oil and gas industry.

We restored the House limitation on changes in OMB Circular A-21, which deals with indirect research costs, but we made that limitation effective for only 60 days.

We agreed to extend the Federal Housing Administration authorization through July 25 of this year, and at the insistence of the Senate conferees, we agreed to a UDAG selection formula which is virtually identical to the formula in the housing authorization act that passed the House earlier this month.

We restored the House provision that places a 1-year moratorium on changes in the Medicare capital payment system.

We provided the embassy security funds by direct appropriation instead of by transfer.

We accepted the Senate limitation on the sale of the power marketing administrations.

These agreements required intense negotiations which extended over many days. They were reached because the conferees and the administration made sincere efforts to get this bill signed into law.

This is a reasonable conference agreement and is now acceptable to the administration. I will vote for the conference report, and I can recommend that my colleagues do likewise.

□ 1700

Let me just state the urgency of getting this supplemental to the President and getting it signed by the President. Only yesterday I received this letter from the district court judge in the Federal court of Boston, Walter J. Skinner. It says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CONTE: Yesterday the Director of Administration Office of the United States Courts informed all district judges that we were to start no new civil jury trials as of June 16th. I understand this is to be because of budgetary restrictions.

He did not know about the supplemental.

You should know that for the first time in the history of this country federal courts will not afford to our citizens, your constituents, the jury trial guaranteed to them by the 7th amendment to the Constitution.

This is extremely shocking and disturbing to me, not only because of the projected hiatus in jury trials until the next fiscal year, but because of its implications concerning the relationship between the Congress and the courts. Certainly Congress exercises proper budgetary control over the courts in terms of salaries, facilities and staffing. When, however, it appears that one of the core constitutional obligations of the judicial system can be casually eviscerated in the budgetary process, the implications for the independence of the courts, the maintenance of our trinitarian balance of power are dire.

I hope you will do all in your power to correct the present situation and to prevent its recurrence.

The bizarre nature of our financing was highlighted by a memo received by the judges in Boston on June 11, the day before the jury announcement. GSA is going to remove our telephone system and furnish us with new units for every judge, secretary, law clerk, deputy clerk, docket clerk, jury clerk, and miscellaneous supernumerary in the entire system. These units will cost the court system $522 apiece. GSA has informed us that this will save a lot of money. Wonderful. We shall have computerized telephones with high-tech capacity of no particular use to us, but no civil jury trials.

Well, Mr. Skinner, I hope you are watching the television, because we have $3.8 million in this supplemental, and you can have your jury system if this is passed and signed by the President.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES

The agriculture chapter of the urgent supplemental as passed the House on May 8, 1986, contained $68.7 million in new budget authority; $104.548 million in program transfers; and deferral disapprovals totaling $700 million. Legislative language directed a report on milk contamination, the restoration of funds transferred from the Iowa Soil Tilth Center and a restoration of funds transferred from the Commodity Supplemental Food Program to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The version of H.R. 4515 passed by the other body on June 6, 1986, contained 25 amendments and provided $5,364,380,000 in new budget authority; $86,488,000 in program transfers; $2.98 million in loan authorization reduction and the $700 million deferral disapproval. Legislative language and specific directives were included for the Temporary Emergency Feeding Program, the CCC, advanced deficiency payments, the Rural Electrification Administration, Swampbuster and Elderly Feeding Programs.

The administration had requested or identified estimated needs totaling $5.306 billion in new budget authority; $71.598 million in program transfers; and $706 million in loan authorization reductions. Legislative language for permanent, indefinite CCC borrowing authority was also submitted.

The conference agreement on the fiscal year 1986 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations Act contains $5,387,417,000 in new budget authority. This totals $5,318,717,000 over the House-passed level, $23,037,000 over the Senate-passed level, and $81.417 million over the administration's requests and estimates for accounts in this chapter.

For program transfers, the conference agreement includes $96,648,000, a level that is $7.9 million below the House allowance, $10.16 million above the Senate allowance and $25.05 million more than the administration's request.

The conferees accepted a $2 million decrease in FmHA loan authorizations. The House had no provision for such reductions; the Senate included $2.98 million in reduc-

tions. The administration had requested reductions totaling $706 million.

Our conference agreement includes the $700 million deferral disapproval concerning FmHA rural housing programs. The administration had notified the Congress of these deferrals on March 12, 1986. The managers intend that this new borrowing authority be immediately made available to the rural housing insurance fund to insure or guarantee rural housing loans for single family homes, rental and cooperative housing, farm labor housing, rural housing sites and to make rental assistance payments as authorized by law.

Among the items contained in the act but not subject to the conference were the $71.598 million transfer from CCC for salaries and expenses at ASCS, as requested by the administration; and the language restoring $3.95 million in funds previously transferred from the CSF Program to the CCC.

Among the increases over the House-passed levels contained in the conference agreement is $5.3 billion in reimbursements to the CCC for net realized losses. This amount represents USDA's most recent estimates of remaining need for fiscal year 1986. To date, the Congress has made $19.609 billion available for fiscal year 1986 reimbursements. With the funds included in this act, $24.909 billion will have been provided to meet CCC obligations, including over $92.7 million in activities authorized in H.R. 4515 and in about $3.4 billion for activities authorized in the 1985 farm bill, Public Law 99-198. The conference agreement does not include the earmark of $4 million in the Senate bill for external combustion engine research and development.

The conferees have also agreed to accept the $11.7 million increase included by the Senate for Soil Conservation Service watershed and flood prevention activities. In total, $36.7 million in supplemental funds are recommended, with $14.7 million in earmarks for projects in West Virginia and Mississippi. The administration had requested a rescission of $60.401 million in this SCS account; the Congress has made $220.772 million available to date. For related Federal disaster relief activities, H.R. 4515 also contains $250 million, the request, for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and $5 million in unrequested Agricultural Conservation and Stabilization Service emergency conservation program supplemental funds.

We have also agreed to include $2.437 million for the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP], to assist States in the distribution and transport of surplus commodities. These funds would bring the fiscal year 1986 enacted total to the $50 million level authorized in the 1985 farm bill. We are recommending an additional $8.5 million for fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1986 meal cost reimbursements in the Elderly Feeding Program, which would provide for a fiscal year 1986 program level of $139.583 million; and $80,000 for the Packers and Stockyards Administration, to meet responsibilities required under section 1324 of Public Law 99-198.

Among the reductions from House-passed levels contained in the agreement are $5 million from the Emergency Conservation Program, that had been funded in the House bill at $10 million; $3.9 million from the CCC transfer to APHIS for citrus canker control and eradication, a reduction from the $14 million transfer contained in the House bill; $1 million from the Dairy Indemnity Program, providing $9 million through the CCC to dairy farmers with herds contaminated by the pesticide heptachlor, an increase of $3 million over the administration's request; and a $5 million reduction in funds to be transferred from the CCC for control of avian influenza, leaving $5 million for the remainder of fiscal year 1986.

The managers on the part of the Senate have accepted the House provisions of $3.7 million for Food Safety and Inspection Service activities; $20 million for the $1.56 billion WIC program to allocate under the current formula; and $5 million in CCC transfers to match State funds for a new international trade center.

The managers on the part of the House have accepted Senate provisions reprioritizing $3 million in FmHA rural housing loan and grant program funds and a legislative provision enabling certain agricultural producers to keep advance deficiency payments received in fiscal year 1986 if natural disasters prevented the planting of their crops. We have receded from our provision requiring a report on contaminated milk, and we have accepted two legislative amendments pertaining to the REA and the swampbuster provision in the 1985 farm bill.

With regard to the exemption from the swampbuster provision of the 1985 farm bill that has been included for the permafrost soils in Alaska, I would like to point out that the House conferees have agreed to this Senate amendment. As a conferee on this urgent supplemental, I have accepted this amendment with the understanding that this exemption will have no significant impact on the precious wetlands, wildlife, and water quality of about 6 million acres in Alaska's Tanana River Valley. However, I am very concerned about the dangerous precedent that this exception may set. And, I would like to say to my colleagues that I intend to carefully examine and vigorously oppose further, proposed exemptions from the swampbuster provision of Public Law 99-198 for other types of wetlands. Let us bear in mind our commitment to halt the destruction of threatened wetlands and waterfowl, further overproduction of crops already in oversupply and the assault on the Federal taxpayer by those who despoil our irreplaceable natural resources.

On the issue of waiving prepayment penalties on REA loans, I do not concur with the conference agreement that has been reached, and have indicated my exception to this amendment in signing the report. As I have stated earlier, this is the issue on which the President has indicated strong opposition; according to the Director of OMB, Jim Miller, the President will not sign this bill into law if the current conference report language is adopted.

We will have an opportunity to discuss the Senate amendment in technical agreement later on in more detail. I would just like to point out this is the only issue standing in the way of a Presidential signature; unless we further amend the language, or strike the provision entirely, we will be subjecting Federal agencies and program participants to further, needless delays in receiving critically needed supplemental funding.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE AND JUDICIARY

The Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary chapter of the conference report provides $766,672,000 in new budget authority. This is $727,626,000 over the House bill and $45,247,000 over the Senate bill.

The reason for the large increase over the House bill is the decision of the conferees to agree to the administration's strong position to provide the entire diplomatic security supplemental, $702,104,000, in new budget authority rather than as a transfer from Defense and Foreign Aid funds.

Included in the Diplomatic Security package is $283 million in salaries and expenses, $409 million for the acquisition and maintenance of buildings, and $10 million for counterterrorism research and development. Language is included in the bill requiring the State Department to seek specific approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees prior to the obligation of building project funds. Bill language is also included providing that the diplomatic security funds shall not be used for any purpose inconsistent with or contrary to authorizing legislation as enacted into law.

Among other Senate amendments in this chapter, the conferees agreed to provide $10.8 million to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to maintain public weather warning and forecast services and to insure adequate aircraft hurricane services.

The conferees also agreed to provide $18.8 million to the Board for International Broadcasting for grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty to sustain their operations during this period of currency exchange shortfalls.

The conference report provides a transfer of $3.9 million for the U.S. Information Agency to initiate a cultural exchange program with the Soviet Union as agreed by President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev at the Geneva summit.

The report also provides additional funding for various Department of Justice activities, including $2.6 million for the U.S. Marshals Service, $3 million for the support of Federal prisoners in State and local institutions, $3 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to deal with Mariel Cubans in INS custody, and $18 million for the Federal prison system due to increased average daily inmate population.

And finally, this chapter provides $3.8 million for fees of jurors and commissioners to enable civil courts cases to proceed. These funds were not subject to conference action, but the delay in these cases has triggered some concern on the part of a number of Members.

DEFENSE

The most difficult issue to resolve in the Defense section was the question of what was and was not authorized in fiscal 1986. Funds had been appropriated in 1986 for programs which were at issue. The House Armed Services Committee maintained $6.3 billion was not authorized. The Senate Armed Services Committee set the figure at 1.3 billion.

Resolving an authorization issue of this magnitude in an appropriations bill required

delicate and prolonged negotiations, and the utmost of cooperation between the House Committees.

An agreement was reached, but it provides for no new funds. The money already was there. The only issue was their release.

The conferees also provided, from available funds, $1.5 billion for the Military Spare Program and an expendable launch vehicle project.

Funds for the pay raise which went into effect last January and for the retirement pay were made available, also without new funding levels.

Also provided are unobligated moneys to be used for Coast Guard operations.

The defense portion of the supplemental conference, in short, allows for the continuation of programs already approved by Congress and the start of some new critical programs, and all without new funds.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

The foreign operations chapter of the conference report provides $150,000,000 in new budget authority. This is $150,000,000 over the House bill and $15,000,000 under the Senate bill. The report also provides $52,739,000 by transfer.

In summary, this chapter provides $50 million for Northern Ireland and Ireland by transfer, $21.7 million for Haiti by earmark, $2.7 million for anti-terrorism assistance by transfer, and $150 million for the Philippines in new budget authority. Language is also included extending the availability of direct lending authority for the Export-Import Bank through fiscal 1987.

With regard to Ireland, the funds are transferred proportionately from each of the four titles of the fiscal year 1986 Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act.

For Haiti, the funds are transferred from fiscal year 1986 Bilateral Economic Assistance Funds subject to the notification process of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Language is included allowing the use of $750,000 in previously appropriated Military Assistance Funds in Haiti for specified non-lethal vehicles and equipment, subject to the notification process.

The Philippines would receive $100 million in Economic Support Funds and $50 million in military assistance, all subject to the notification process. The funds are made available until March 31, 1987. The military assistance is limited to an itemized list included in the statement of the managers on the bill unless notification is presented proposing any changes.

HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

The HUD-independent agencies chapter of the urgent supplemental as passed the House on May 8, 1986 contained $614,553,000 in new budget authority; $138,721,000 in program transfers; a $3.429 limitation increase for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and $3,462,615,000 in individual housing and community development program deferral disapprovals.

The version of H.R. 4515 as passed the Senate on June 6, 1986 contained −$3,303,504,000 in budget authority; $1,139,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 supplemental appropriations; $4,442,504,000 in fiscal year 1986 rescissions; $145.02 million in program transfers; the $3.429 million limitation increase; $3,462,615,000 in deferral disapprovals; $51.518 million in contract authority reductions; legislative language pertaining to the UDAG Program; and $108.58 billion in new guaranteed loan limitations for FHA and GNMA.

The administration had requested $164.553 million in new budget authority; rescissions totalling $1,442,504,000; $10.1 million in program transfers; the $3.429 million limitation increase; $6.5 billion in additional FHA guaranteed loan authority; estimates of $51.518 million in contract authority reductions; and fiscal year 1986 deferrals totalling $3,462,615,000.

The conference agreement includes new budget authority and rescissions affecting program levels in both fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987. We have included −$5,646,951,000 in budget authority, an amount that is $6,261,504,000 below the House-passed level, $2,343,447,000 below the Senate-passed level, and $5,032,398,000 below the administration's request. For fiscal year 1987, the impact on new budget authority is $5.942 billion; the House and Senate bills contained no provision for fiscal year 1987, and the administration made no request for fiscal year 1987 funds in this supplemental for fiscal year 1986.

The $1,045,553,000 in new fiscal year 1986 appropriations recommended in this agreement represent a $431 million increase over the House-passed level, a $93.447 million decrease from Senate-passed levels; and a $431 million increase over the administration's request. Our agreement also includes a $100 million appropriation for NASA to be made available in fiscal year 1987 contingent upon certification from the administrator that the recommendations of the Rogers Commission are being implemented. No similar provision was contained in the House or Senate bills; no request for these funds has been made by the administration.

Fiscal year 1986 rescissions in this chapter of the conference agreement total $6,692,504,000 for fiscal year 1986, a level which is $2.25 billion above that contained in the Senate version, and $5.25 billion above the administration's request. For fiscal year 1987, we have agreed to rescind $6.042 billion. No such provision for fiscal year 1987 was contained in the Senate version or the administration's request. The House bill contained no provisions for fiscal year 1986 or fiscal year 1987 rescissions.

$5.25 billion of the fiscal year 1986 funds rescinded, and the entire $6.042 billion in fiscal year 1987 rescissions are funds which both Houses and the President have already agreed to rescind at the end of these fiscal years. Language providing for these automatic rescissions was contained in the fiscal year 1986 HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-160) and the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-272). The remainder of the $1.4 billion fiscal year 1986 rescissions are standard, annual rescissions in the Rent Supplement Program and the Rental Housing Assistance Program.

The conference agreement contains $150.02 million in fiscal year 1986 program transfers, $11.299 more than in the House-passed bill, $5 million more than in the Senate-passed bill, and $139.92 million above the administration's request.

For limitations on guaranteed loans, we have included $108.58 billion, the same as contained in the Senate-passed version and $100.08 billion more than the administration requested. The House had no similar provision.

Our agreement includes the $3,462,615,000 Housing and Community Development Program deferral disapprovals as contained in the House and Senate-passed bills. We have also included the $3.429 million limitation increase for the FHLBB, as requested by the administration, and contained in both versions of the bill. We have also included the $51.518 million reduction in contract authority limitations requested by the administration and contained in the Senate bill.

Among the seven items not subject to conference, but contained in the act, are: $272 million for Veterans' Compensation and Pensions, as requested; $91 million in Veterans Readjustment Benefits, as requested; $250 million in Federal Emergency Management Agency disaster relief, as requested; a $3 million transfer in the Environmental Protection Agency for salaries and expenses; $2.92 million transfer in FEMA for salaries and expenses; a $38.1 million transfer in NASA for research and program management; and the $3.429 million FHLBB administrative expense limitation increase, as requested.

Of the major increases recommended over House-passed levels, the managers have agreed to include an increase in Federal Housing Administration Fund mortgage insurance and loan commitment authority. The $57.58 billion increase will increase fiscal year 1986 levels to $132 billion.

We have also increased the guarantee authority of the Government National Mortgage Association by $49 billion to bring fiscal year 1986 limitation levels to $175 billion. The administration had requested a $6.5-billion increase for FHA only.

For the EPA construction grants program, the conferees have agreed to make an additional $1.2 billion available out of the $2,374,200,000 appropriated in Public Law 99-160. These funds have not previously been released due to the lack of authorization. However, in light of the fact that, after 7 months, the Clean Water Act has not yet been reauthorized, and more than 20 States have depleted their allocations of the $600 million previously made available, we have agreed to release these additional funds. This action will enable eligible projects to proceed to construction, to meet the critical needs of localities at a timely point in the construction season. Funds are to be expended under the fiscal year 1985 formulae.

The conference agreement includes $531 million for NASA, a $5 million increase over the Senate provision. The House had included no similar provision; the administration has not submitted a budget request for any amount. Five million dollars is included for research and development on the flight telerobotic services for the space station. Five hundred and twenty-six million dollars is provided for costs associated with restoring the space

shuttle transportation system to flight status, and to maintain the production capability for a replacement orbiter. One hundred million dollars of the total provided remains unavailable until fiscal year 1987 when the NASA Administrator certifies that the recommendations of the Rogers Commission have been implemented, are being implemented, or that an alternative approach satisfies the objective of the recommendation. Finally, we have included report language directing a study on alternative rocket booster designs to be completed by December 31, and directing that an RFP for a "second source" be issued if the agency determines that such action is feasible within available resources.

The conference agreement contains a number of supplementals and program transfers for the Veterans' Administration, including a transfer of an additional $25 to $30 million to the medical care account to maintain the 193,941 staffing level authorized in Pub. L. 99-160 last November.

Finally, the managers have agreed to accept the Senate language extending the FHA mortgage insurance authority to July 25. This marks the seventh short-term extension passed by the House since the beginning of the fiscal year. During these past 8 months, the HUD Secretary's authority to issue FHA loan commitments has lapsed for almost 50 days. Most recently, the authority expired on June 6.

While I am pleased that the conferees have addressed this situation which has imposed such hardship on thousands of families seeking to buy homes with FHA financing, I regret that we have once again intruded on the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees. This time, however, our action comes as a result of the insistence on the part of the conferees in the other body that we accept not only an extension of an authorization, but an unrelated amendment pertaining to the UDAG program that was made a part of amendment 114.

The 11-page amendment to the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 establishes new selection criteria for UDAG's to become effective in the current large cities round. The only modification agreed to by the Senate conferees included the deletion of one provision that would have doubled the project merit points for certain projects in cities that have not received a UDAG since October 1984. Despite the fact that the language is very similar to that passed by the House on June 12 during consideration of H.R. 4746, as a Member who has worked since mid-March to delete legislative provisions from this bill making urgent supplemental appropriations, I regret that we have acted against the expressed interests of our authorizing committee members.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Although not urgent, chapter 7 contains many of the program supplementals requested by the administration. Of the $420 million in new budget authority provided in this chapter, $65 million was added above the administration's request. This amount is approximately $35 million more than total provided in the House passed bill.

The conferees agreed to overturn approximately $662.6 million of the $876 million proposed fo deferral by the administration. This amount includes oil acquisition funds for the strategic petroleum reserve, construction funds for SPR storage facilities and Department of Energy funding for R&D programs in Fossil Energy and Conservation.

The conference agreement contains only $28.9 million in rescissions out of $189 million proposed by the administration, and almost all of this amount is rescinded contract authority for Park Service land acquisition.

The conferees also accepted a Senate amendment requested by the administration whcih appropriates $1,020,360,322 for alternate fuels production. This appropriation would repay notes issued by the Secretary of Energy to the Secretary of the Treasury to repay the Federal Financing Bank for the default debt on the Great Plains coal gasification plant. The amendment is largely a bookkeeping transaction, and no outlay of funds is involved.

The conference agreement also includes several legislative provisions. A House amendment to reestablish the Cape Cod National Seashore Commission was accepted and a modified version of a Senate amendment to transfer Forest Service land in Georgia to Brantley County. As revised, the amendment authorizes the transfer of 55 acres to the county for the current fair market value in cash or exchange of lands or some other interest. The conference agreement also includes language and appropriations for the implementation of the Compact of Free Association recently enacted by the Congress for several Basin U.S. territories in the Pacific.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

Chapter VIII of this supplemental includes $175.5 million in new budget authority for the Departments of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, together with several critical provisions effecting all three Departments under the jurisdiction of the Labor-HHS Subcommittee. This amount is $149.5 million more than the original House-passed bill.

By far the largest part of this increase is due to the approval of $146 million for the Pell Grant Program. I am very pleased that we were able to come out of conference with these funds. With them we will be able to restore grants to over 100,000 needy students who would have been cut from the program, as well as lessen the reductions on nearly 800,000 more.

Due in part to reestimates that occurred after the fiscal year 1986 Labor-HHS bill had been passed by this body, a large shortfall developed in the Pell Grant Program. And then, adding insult to injury, along came this mindless Gramm-Rudman sequester. As many of you know, I voted against that bill and I have continued to battle it in the courts. Now that it appears that a Supreme Court decision on that case is imminent, I want to assure my colleagues that I will be following the course of those funds sequestered in the Pell Grant Program very carefully. In addition, I will continue to pursue ways to make up any remaining shortfall as the year goes on.

I am also pleased to report that the Senate has agreed to the House provision providing $6 million in funds to prevent the closing of our national cancer research centers. I was proud to offer that amendment when this bill first came to the House, and I say now, as I said then, we have come too far, and invested too much, to let these centers go. By approving this money we will ensure that the centers' phenomenal work will continue, and the ambitious course we have set to prevent and cure cancer in our people will be maintained.

In addition to the supplemental funds provided for Pell grants, this bill also includes $2 million to support pediatric emergency medical services demonstration programs not in the original House-passed bill. These funds will ensure that continued attention is given to the medical needs of the children and youth of this country.

The House also agreed to provide an additional $1.5 million for the renovation of the homeless shelter here in the District of Columbia. The Department of Health and Human Services has already made available from existing funds $5 million for this purpose. These additional funds are provided to make sure that the renovation of that facility will occur before the winter months arrive.

The conference agreement retains the $20 million in disaster relief payments for the Impact Aid Program originally approved by the House. I am also pleased to report that we retained a provision that would correct the Department of Education's recent action to collect small overpayments made to school districts over 8 years ago. Several months ago I received a letter from the Granby Public Schools in my congressional district outlining this action by the Department.

Though the total amount involved is relatively small, the sudden repayment of this amount represented an immediate and pressing problem for that school district. Accordingly, I am pleased that this conference report includes my amendment that directs that those overpayments made in 1978 shall only be collected through offsets in future year impact aid payments to those districts.

The conference report also includes two important general provisions relating to the Labor/HHS Subcommittee. The first, in a modification of the original House language, would provide for a moratorium of 60 days, after enactment of this bill, on changes in the current reimbursement policy on indirect research costs. I am hopeful that this time period will allow our universities and colleges to work together with the OMB to come up with a fair policy on these costs.

Our subcommittee has been following this issue closely for several years, and has rejected earlier proposals because they focused soley on research conducted through the Department of Health and Human Services. As I have said all along, this new policy, whenever it is enacted, should apply across the board and not focus on one particular department.

The other provision I want to mention provides an additional year for us to come up with a solution to the hospital capital policy under the Medicare Program. As I understand it, the current proposal put on the table by HHS would result by 1991 in hospitals being reimbursed for less than half of their expected capital costs. This proposal would have caused serious harm to one hospital I am particularly familiar with: the Bay State Medical

Center in Springfield, MA. I am pleased that the Senate has receded to the original House position on this, and I am hopeful that a better policy can be developed by all interested parties in the near future.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The legislative branch chapter of the conference report provides $25,962,000 in the new budget authority. This is $15,117,000 over the House bill and $3,900,000 over the Senate bill.

The major item in this chapter is the total of $14,250,000 provided for anticipated costs related to improved security for the U.S. Capitol and the House and Senate office buildings. Of this amount, $1 million is for additional Capitol Police to fill existing vacancies and to avoid furloughs, $13 million is for the implementation of an improved security plan after such a plan runs a veritable gauntlet of approvals by the appropriate congressional committees, and $250,000 is for detailed design and costs estimates for the plan.

While the conferees are including these funds in the bill, we are in no way prescribing what this security plan will entail. Questions about the details, such as will there be a fence around the Capitol or not, are not resolved in this bill. Those questions will be dealt with by the appropriate authorizing committees, and then, and only then, the Appropriations Committees will review the scope and cost estimates for approval, revision or disapproval.

The conference report also provides $867,000 for the Library of Congress to alleviate certain funding constraints which have affected the Library's services to the public and to school and public libraries around the country. Specifically, the bill includes $500,000 for the acquisition of books and other Library materials, $120,000 for cataloging, and $247,000 to reopen the reading rooms during evening and weekend hours. In regard to this last item, the conferees have stated in the report that if these funds are insufficient to provide adequate reading room hours, the librarian is directed to use other available funds.

And finally, in connection with this chapter the conferees have included language in the statement of the managers addressing the problem of increasing official mail cost. The language notes the partial success each body is having in reducing the volume of outgoing mail, and it recommends that the House and Senate leadership appoint a temporary Joint Committee to design a proposal for appropriate changes in mailing policies for the House and Senate in time for the upcoming 100th Congress.

TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

In the transportation chapter of the supplemental, additional funds are provided for Coast Guard operating expenses, amounting to $35.5 million in new funds and $10.4 million from other Coast Guard accounts. In addition, $750,000 will be made available from available funds for the preservation of lighthouses in Massachusetts.

For the Federal Aviation Administration, the conferees have agreed to supplemental funding of $84.25 million, including $4.25 million by transfer. The conferees expect that air traffic control onboard employment shall be at least 14,480 by the end of the fiscal year.

The conferees have agreed to an additional $5 million from the emergency highway relief fund to address the flooding of I-80 by the Great Salt Lake in Utah.

For redeemable preference shares, the conferees have agreed to language confirming the reauthorization of this program through fiscal year 1988.

Finally, for the Panama Canal, we have included $18.3 million, to be used for a combination of operating expenses, vessel accident claims, and payments to the Republic of Panama. The operating expense funds will be used to offset the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions if legislation is not passed by the end of the year exempting the Canal Commission from that measure. There is no budgetary impact, since the money will either be used for operations or will have to be paid as a windfall payment to Panama under our treaty obligations.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Under the Energy and Water Development chapter of the supplemental, the conferees have provided additional funds for the Corps of Engineers flood control and coastal emergencies program, in the amount of $25 million. In addition, the conferees have agreed to language directing the corps to develop emergency contingency plans to prevent or control flooding along the Great Lakes. I know that this was of concern to my colleagues from the Great Lakes region, and I believe that this direction will be helpful to that area.

The conferees have agreed to language disapproving a number of proposed deferrals of energy research and development funding. As a result of this language, important and much-needed funding for wind energy, ocean energy, and photovoltaics research, among others, will be made available for obligation.

Finally, the conferees have agreed to language proposed by the Senate that prohibits further consideration without prior authorization of proposals to defederalize the power marketing administrations and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of course there never have been any proposals relating to the TVA, so that issue is moot. I think it is a mistake to cut off studies of the power marketing administrations at this time. There are a lot of unanswered questions, the answers to which could well result in a structure that would be more effective, efficient, and ultimately to the benefit of ratepayers and taxpayers alike. I opposed this language in conference, but obviously mine was a minority position. I hope that appropriate authority to continue consideration of this issue will soon be enacted.

TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE-GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Chapter 11 provides $374.8 million in new budget authority for departments and agencies within the jurisdiction of the Treasury-Postal Service-General Government Subcommittee. No rescissions or deferrals are included in this chapter.

Most of the new spending provided in this chapter was requested by the administration. $340 million was included in the House and Senate versions of H.R. 4515 for staffing and hardware requirements of the Internal Revenue Service. This truly urgent supplemental will provide computer services and 6950 FTE to revitalize tax return processing, to improve taxpayer service and to strengthen enforcement. The IRS estimates that these additional resources will protect an extra $1 billion in revenue.

In addition to the urgent IRS supplemental, this conference agreement includes $30.8 million for salaries and expenses of the U.S. Customs Service and $3.2 million for the Customs Air Interdiction Program. Both of these amendments restore Gramm-Rudman cuts triggered earlier this year.

The agreement also includes $500,000 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to initiate a special occupation tax compliance program. Estimates by the Grace Commission indicate that nearly 60 percent of the Nation's liquor retailers fail to pay the Federal special occupation tax, with a loss of revenue to the Treasury of up to $25 million annually. These funds should provide the necessary resources for BATF to start a compliance program and bridge the nonpayment gap.

A Senate amendment was accepted that raised the funding limit on the cost of the Charleston, SC, Post Office and Courthouse annex project by $3.5 million, and another Senate amendment accepted by the conferees increased the ceiling for GSA transportation audit contract administration from $5.2 million to $7.6 million during fiscal year 1986.

This chapter also includes several language provisions. Amendment 208 transfers a parcel of Federal land in New Mexico to the city of Sante Fe, and the House language establishing a personnel floor for the Customs Service was included in the agreement.

The Senate included two tax provisions that were not accepted by the House conferees. Amendment 200 would have extended the statute of limitations for certain insolvent farmers to file amended 1982 income tax returns. The amendment was necessary to give farmers the opportunity to take advantage of a provision in the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 which exempted them from minimum tax liability in certain areas. The conferees deleted this amendment because there is a similar provision in the Senate tax reform bill.

Amendment 199 was reported in true disagreement. This provision would prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from issuing regulations dealing with recordkeeping on business use of personal automobiles. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means claims that this amendment is in violation of House rule XXI, clause 5B.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], who has done such a masterful job on the defense part of this bill.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for yielding. I want initially to express my appreciation and I am sure that of our colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle for the tremendous job that has been done in bringing this bill to the floor in a method that will see it enacted into law. The gentleman did yeoman work, and I want to offer him my congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 4515 and urge its adoption by the House.

The defense portion of this supplemental is not controversial in my view, but is extremely important, because we fund some of the most worthwhile and important items in the defense establishment.

For example, this bill funds the military pay raise which the Congress authorized last year. We provide $2.1 billion to accommodate the existing shortfall in the military retirement accounts, money needed to fully fund the benefits due our veterans. And there is $260 million to keep the health program which provides care for military dependents—the CHAMPUS Program—in operation.

In all, this is $4 billion in "quality of life" programs for our men and women in uniform.

In addition, this bill contains $1.5 billion for the Defense Department Space Recovery Program—the production of expendable, unmanned rocket boosters. These are vitally needed now, after the *Challenger* tragedy, in order to make up lost ground in the area of national security space payloads.

Equally important in these times of tight budgets, we have done all this without appropriating one new dollar in budget authority. Rather, we have used prior year appropriations—inflation dividends, contract savings, fuel price reductions—that we identified last year and specifically fenced in the continuing resolution for such contingencies.

When we did this last year, some Members claimed we were creating a slush fund, a Gramm-Rudman cushion for the Pentagon. I think the contents of this bill—providing over $6 billion for these important activities, without having to use one new dollar in spending authority—shows that these critics were dead wrong.

The defense chapter deals with many other issues of great importance to Members of this House. A full list would consume all of the time for debate, but let me cite a few: Emergency aid to the Philippines, drug interdiction, the T-46 trainer, the air defense aircraft competition for the Air Force.

All of these were conference issues in defense. I can report that all were resolved in a manner consistent with the stated positions of this body.

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, the defense portion of H.R. 4515 provides for a great number of essential activities by the Department of Defense, all of which are funded with prior year funds—no new money. I would add that this chapter was agreed to by all four of the defense oversight committees of Congress—the first time in my memory this has ever happened, surely a testament to the contents of this bill.

This conference report merits our strong support, and I call for an overwhelming vote in its favor.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman.

I think it is noteworthy to let the House know that my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, scored an eagle the other day from 160 yards. Congratulations.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank our distinguished chairman for his great leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4515, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill. This bill provides $5.3 billion in additional funding for the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC], the main funding agency for Government farm programs.

Although it contains many other supplementals, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill in expediting the flow of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to those farmers who have not yet received their payments. As for the REA Coops refinancing provision, I am glad the White House accepted a language change to avoid a veto.

American farmers are desperately needing their funds. These funds have been more than just promised: They are obligated. We owe this money to our beleagured and financially strapped farmers facing a difficult transition from easy credit, inflation, and booming exports to lower commodity prices amid worldwide surpluses of many kinds.

These funds are being used by many farmers to pay for operating expenses and in many situations may be the only money available to them. Many farmers had asked their creditors to hold off until payments were received. However, these creditors' patience is running out, and they are putting pressure on their farmer clients to pay up.

These same creditors are continuing to charge interest—far higher than in other sectors of the economy. This only adds to the financial troubles of farmers. The added expense begins to cut deeply into whatever small profit might remain for many producers. It may well cut into living and other areas of economic necessity.

The CCC has been without funds since June 3, thus denying farmers payments and loans due them under Federal farm programs. Three weeks have passed since the money ran out. These are among the busiest weeks of the year for farmer participation in Government funding. Congress must get the CCC back into the business of making payments to the financially distressed farmers before irreparable financial damage occurs to more farmers.

Congress in passing the 1985 farm bill dedicated itself to helping the farmers and ranchers of this country to survive this difficult transition period. Any further delay of this appropriations bill could destroy any lingering belief in our commitment to our farmers and ranchers.

These payments not only affect the farmers and ranchers but also all those main street businesses that depend on the farmer for their livelihood. Rural communities are hurting along with the farmers and ranchers and desperately need our assistance. The economic viability of these communities must not erode further.

These payments not only provide for the physical needs of our farmers but also provide for the psychological well-being of the farmer and his family. Families desperate for relief from the burden of economic trouble do not have the time or ability to wait.

In conclusion, I urge the Congress to vote for H.R. 4515 to replenish the Commodity Credit Corporation. We must act swiftly and decisively to help keep many family farmers and ranchers on their farms and working their land.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the chairman and the members of the Appropriations Committee for the excellent work they have done in this endeavor. I know how difficult it is to work in a conference and in an area that has so many problems as the supplemental appropriation bill.

We still have objections basically, contrary to the language of the rules, that infringes on the Appropriations Committee, but this is not the time nor the place, nor the vehicle, to raise those objections, and we will not.

There are some technical amendments in disagreement that would not relate to aiding the farmer that we will object to at the proper time or discuss, at least, at the proper time; but the need of the American agricultural sector of rural America is such that we must do everything that we can to help, even if it requires compromise, as we are willing to do today, to compromise those very important areas, very technical areas for us in the Agriculture Committee, and we can appreciate the delicate position in which the Appropriations Committee found itself. I am certain that they did the best that they could under the circumstances.

Having some of the areas that were objectionable to the White House resolved in a way that this House, as I am informed by my distinguished colleague, the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts, that it is now agreeable to the White House in this form, we would not want in any way to detract from that agreement.

Therefore, we support and I personally support the conference report and I am appreciative of the work that has been done.

We will impose our jurisdictional items at other times when the time is proper and when we do not interfere with something as positive as this is and it is helpful and needed for rural America.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me the time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there were 224 amendments on the other side of the Capitol. I appreciate the kind of statements that have been made here.

I think we have made some real progress, because instead of going through this, that and the other, I went to the place where the problem was and I talked directly to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and I talked directly to the Secretary of the Treasury. We had a little trouble getting together, but up until that time nobody had given us any information as to what the problem was. We were just told that so and so was against it, so and so was going to recommend a veto.

I think we have worked this out much better.

Certainly I have the highest regard, personal and otherwise, for my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Agriculture Committee. I fully appreciate the problem they have with regard to dealing with this subject. But let me say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, in every bill that we have there are lots of minor things that the legislative committees have not found fit to correct. They are minor. They are technical. But as long as they do not correct those things so that we can go ahead, we are faced with having to go ahead in spite of them.

I want to urge here in the RECORD to all our friends on the legislative committees, particularly the chairmen, talk to our committee or our staff, talk to them, so these little things that tie us in knots here will not continue to do that.

Let me repeat again, I am proud of what we did here and I am proud of having gone directly to where the problem was, because they added 224 amendments, adding over $2 billion to the figure we had. It makes sense from their viewpoint, and we in turn have to work with it.

So I say again, I appreciate everybody's problems here. We do our best to work with them.

I think it is quite an accomplishment for us to come here with 224 amendments worked out satisfactorily, as far as I know, with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I do want to urge our friends on the legislative committee to give some thought to these little things that are really insignificant, except they tie a knot in the procedures here.

I hope you will support the committee on this.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS].

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

Mr. SPEAKER, the supplemental appropriations bill contains a number of extremely important programs that make swift action on it crucial. Let me turn first to the farm issues.

Last December, Congress passed the 1985 farm bill, which set out conditions and terms of farm programs. Farmers have abided by the conditions of participation but they have been left in a lurch by the inability of the CCC to make expected payments.

Dairy farmers, acutely aware of need to eliminate the glut of milk, agreed to go out of business by selling for slaughter or export their cows. By entering into the so-called whole-herd buyout program, these farmers will be saving taxpayers more than $6 billion in the next few years. Many of these farmers, however, are now in an incredible bind. Cows are what generated their income but they have sold their cows in order to comply with the conditions of the USDA contract. Now they have no income at all until we enact this legislation.

The supplemental must be passed—quickly—so that these farmers may receive the payments due them. To defeat or delay this supplemental bill would be to perpetrate the unfairness that congressional inaction has already created.

The conference agreement also includes a provision which would permit rural utilities to refinance loans through the Rural Electrification Administration without a prepayment penalty.

Mr. Speaker, many rural utilities in all regions of the country are struggling to get out from under the debt incurred when interest rates approached 20 percent. Some of that debt reflects huge investments made by rural utilities at the urging of REA into nuclear projects that have since fallen through, leaving the utilities holding the bag. These large debts must be spread among a small number of users, resulting in substantial rate increases and the threat of bankruptcy in some cases. The burden of these rate increase falls most heavily on our farmers, our small businesses, and our residential consumers.

Rural utilities already face considerably higher costs in the distribution and maintenance of their systems than investor-owned utilities. This provision will simply allow rural utilities to do what thousands of other businesses and individuals throughout the country are doing: Take advantage of lower interest rates by restructuring and refinancing their debt.

Another critical area of this bill concerns the Pell Grant Program. The estimated Pell grant shortfall this year is $370 million, $154 million of which is due to the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions. This supplemental appropriations contains $146 million, which does not meet the total need, but is a step in the right direction. In fact, this figure will restore Pell grants to approximately 100,000 students who would otherwise have their grants eliminated through the linear reduction formula.

The Department of Education is given little leeway with respect to how to address this issue. One avenue allowed is linear reduction. Under linear reduction, students whose expected family contributions are $200 or less would not have their awards reduced. The amount to be saved under linear reduction is supposed to be taken from student awards inversely to need. That is, students with the least need would face the largest reductions. If such supplemental is approved, the Department of Education estimates that 290,000 Pell-eligible students will lose their grants, and 768,000 recipients will have their awards reduced.

The effect of this shortfall is significant in Vermont. For example, this shortfall means a loss of approximately 18.4 percent ($1,376,000) in Pell Grant awards to Vermont students. Additionally, the shortfall would result in an average reduction, including grant terminations, of $450 for 2,500 students, or 61 percent of Vermonters currently receiving Pell grants.

On the other hand, with the supplemental contained in this bill, 200 Vermont student who otherwise would not receive awards, will be receiving awards this fall. Further, this supplemental will assure that the awards for about 1,800 Vermont students will be positively affected, and some of the loss due to the shortfall restored.

It is critical that this shortfall be addressed, in whole or in part. There is no way that either our colleges and universities or the States can make up such a loss of funds. Not only will the impact of the shortfall, if not addressed, have severe effects on Vermont, the results nationwide will be devastating. I urge your support of

this provision in the name of educational access and opportunity for our most needy postsecondary students.

So again I commend the chairman and the ranking member and all the members of the committee for bringing this back in a very important document to help these people.

□ 1715

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] for a colloquy.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to engage the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation in a short colloquy.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I would be pleased to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, is it the gentleman's understanding that the purpose of Amendment 222, which was added by the other body and reported in technical disagreement, is to assure that New York City will receive all Federal funds it would otherwise be entitled to for this fiscal year?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Although I was not a conferee on this particular amendment, my understanding is that you are correct.

Mr. GREEN. The statement of the managers, however, could leave the impression that the interstate transfer funds could be held up notwithstanding the conference action. Is it your understanding that the conferees intended interstate transfer funds to be treated in the same manner as other Federal funds, that they will be obligated if, by September 30, 1986, the Secretary of Transportation approves the plans, specifications, and estimates and issues a letter of authority to proceed with a project utilizing such funds as is the case under current law and practice?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Yes, the gentleman from New York is correct; that is my understanding.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on the Interior and related agencies chapter of the supplemental includes rejections of deferrals totaling $662,566,000, two rescissions totaling $28,920,000, and appropriations totaling $420,414,000.

The most critical element in the chapter is the rejection of four deferrals proposed by the administration for Department of Energy programs. Although labeled deferrals by the administration, they bear the characteristics of rescissions. Specifically, the deferrals being overturned are in fossil energy research and development, energy conservation, and the strategic petroleum reserve. Overturning the fossil energy and energy conservation deferrals permits the Department of Energy to continue crucial research and development programs. In the strategic petroleum reserve the conference agreement provides for continued construction of storage capacity, and releases $577 million to purchase additional oil. I believe just as the statement of the managers indicates that the Department of Energy should move immediately to purchase oil at current low prices, since our import vulnerability will grow significantly in the near future.

Of the $420,414,000 in supplemental appropriations included in the agreement, $200,200,000 is to pay for the costs of fires on public lands already incurred; and $201,500,000 is for implementation of the compact of free association in the Pacific islands. Other minor amounts are included for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Geological Survey, the Minerals Management Service, the Forest Service, and various Indian programs. With regard to contract support funds in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the managers on the part of the House have no objection to the use of fiscal year 1986 funds to fund these costs for contracts entered into by Indian tribes prior to fiscal year 1986.

Finally, the agreement includes an appropriation to repay the Treasury for loans to the Secretary of Energy made to cover the default on a FFB loan for construction of the Great Plains gasification plant. This is a bookkeeping transaction, which reduces the debt and has no outlay effect.

It has come to our attention that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is planning to shut down the northern California agency in Hoopa, CA, and to open a new agency in Redding, CA, and two new subagencies in Klamath and Willow Creek, CA. This proposal, which is estimated to cost over $600,000, falls under the Interior Subcommittee's reprogramming guidelines, since it involves the use of funds appropriated for one purpose or another never presented nor justified to the Congress. Although the Bureau and Department of the Interior have been informed of this fact, no reprogramming proposal has been submitted. Therefore, the Bureau is directed not to proceed with this proposal until a reprogramming request has been submitted to and approved by the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member representing one of the farm-oriented districts in this country, I rise in strong support of the supplemental appropriations conference report before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, since I came to Washington I have learned that many who administer farm programs for the Government are very often themselves unaware of the practical realities of running a farm. I grew up on a farm and I can assure you that life on the farm is never easy. However, I can also tell you that a critical element in the effective management of a farm is the assurance to the farmer that he can rely on the Federal Government to live up to its commitments and to properly manage its programs.

This year has been a disaster in Government management. The Government has not lived up to its commitments, nor has it managed its programs efficiently or effectively. The effect of poor management has been to create turmoil, and compound the economic depression that currently besets the farm community.

This year—one of the most devastating for America's farmers—the Government's primary lending agencies have shut down repeatedly because of a lack of funding. In February, the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] was without money for 5 days—and again, in March, for 19 days. On June 4, both the CCC and ASCS, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, ran out of money. Today marks the 21st day the Government has been unable to meet its obligations to farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the significance of this is that without funding local ASCS offices cannot issue checks to farmers for advance deficiency payments, commodity loans, rice marketing loans, whole-herd dairy buy out bids, or conservation reserve bids.

These erratic interruptions in the Government's funding agencies has put an extraordinary strain on farmers who are trying to manage in an industry totally dependent on a reliable source of financing for its annual operation.

These recurring shortages in Federal farm crop support programs could be averted if USDA officials did not repeatedly underestimate program costs.

In the President's budget request for fiscal 1986, the administration estimated that the CCC would need $10.5 billion to meet its obligations. The administration has returned to Congress twice for additional appropriations. It now estimates that the CCC will need at least $22.3 billion this year for the farm programs it administers.

This new estimate is more than double the original contained in President Reagan's budget.

Clearly, the USDA did not take into account the severity of the farm crisis when it estimated the needs of CCC. It has missed the mark three times—by billions of dollars.

However, Mr. Speaker, while the administration continues to trip over its own shoestrings, 20 percent of the farmers in my district are forced to sit on their hands waiting for their advance deficiency payments, and winter wheat farmers who are harvesting are still waiting for their commodity loans to finance future production. Farmers once again find themselves waiting on the administration to solve its own problems before it can even begin to help farmers with theirs.

Congress must step in and assist farmers by approving the supplemental appropriations and restoring CCC and ASCS funding so that these agencies can carry out their duties to the American farmer.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH]

Mr. ENGLISH. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, and would call my colleagues' attention to the language which, for the first time, establishes a capability within DOD and the civilian law enforcement agencies to participate in a true war on drugs. The drug problem has been featured in the media in recent days, but this has illuminated only the tip of the iceberg. We have seen photographs of loads of drugs that have been seized. We have discovered that our borders are open to any smuggler or terrorist who wants to cross. We hear criticism of the complicity and corruption of foreign governments that appear indifferent to the flow of narcotics from their soil.

But, the real war on drugs is a long-term effort, and these are just the shocking symptoms of a terribly persistent problem.

In the past 4 years, the Government Operations Subcommittee, which I chair, has held 36 hearings on the drug problem. We have found that there are glaring weaknesses in America's response to drug abuse. We know that the war on drugs cannot be waged with photo opportunities and press releases. It's a real problem and requires a real solution.

The war on drugs consists of four vital areas: crop eradication in foreign countries, drug interdiction at our borders, investigation and prosecution of drug traffickers, and education of our citizens.

We quickly found that, while there are deficiencies in all of these areas, the most glaring failures were in drug interdiction. We found that, as recently as last year, there were only two aircraft in the entire Customs Service which were properly equipped to intercept drug smugglers. We found that there were almost no radars anywhere in the country which would detect low-flying aircraft as they approached our borders. Even today, there are vast areas along the United States-Mexico border where a B-52 could fly across at altitudes in excess of 14,000 feet without being seen on any radar screen—not even NORAD. Some figures indicate that we don't see even 1 out of 300 smugglers, let alone catch them. Yet DEA tells us that 62 percent of the cocaine which is used in this country arrives by private aircraft.

We have not had a war on drugs. We have not given our law enforcement agencies the tools with which to wage a war. There are fewer people in Customs today than there were in 1980. Budget cuts have crippled the Coast Guard, our primary maritime interdiction agency. Tactical intelligence, which these agencies need desperately, is almost nonexistent.

But, there is hope.

My subcommittee, assisted by a decidedly bipartisan group of Members and Senators, by the Defense Department, and recently by the Drug Enforcement Policy Board, devised a plan to provide for the basic needs of our interdiction agencies. This plan, which is championed in the Senate by Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, will make available a mix of ground radars, airborne surveillance aircraft, interceptors, helicopters, intelligence, communications equipment, and command-and-control capability so that we have a fighting chance.

This bold package could never have been constructed without the personal dedication of many people.

I deeply appreciate and commend the chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. CONTE, for their support.

Armed Services Chairman LES ASPIN, with the support of his Readiness Subcommittee Chairman DAN DANIEL and Special Operations Forces Panel Chairman EARL HUTTO, brought their tremendous expertise and commitment to the problem.

BILL CHAPPELL, who chairs the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense took the offensive in the recent conference to keep the plan intact.

Our friend CHARLEY BENNETT, chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Seapower, has been a leader in this struggle for more years than any of us. Rules Committee Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, who feels the needs of the people as deeply as any Member who has ever served in this Congress, has been our staunch ally.

CHARLEY RANGEL has directed the Select Committee on Narcotics into many of these issues, and has been personally involved for years.

The Vice President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General have all recently written to the chairmen of the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of both Houses to confirm that most of the elements of the plan are now administration policy. In fact, they broadened it to include initiatives in education and prosecution which were not included in the original scheme, but which are also badly needed.

I anxiously await the administration's presentation of this urgent funding package at the earliest opportunity. Last January the President called drug trafficking and terrorism the two greatest evils in this hemisphere today.

He is right, and we must act.

This bill contains another element urgently needed by farmers in Oklahoma and the Nation. The farm programs adopted last year at the urging of the administration push grain market prices below the cost of production and make up the difference with Government payments. The programs are very expensive to taxpayers, and they force the Commodity Credit Corporation to use up all the funds available to it. This occurred 3 weeks ago, and farmers who depend on CCC for crop loans and payments are left high and dry. Some are being forced to sell their grain at harvest time when prices are always the lowest.

The bill contains an appropriation to allow CCC to resume its operations on behalf of American family farmers.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the pending conference report to accompany H.R. 4515, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986. This is an important and comprehensive bill with a number of important provisions, three of which I wish to focus on today.

The first relates to the $702 million appropriated in the bill for improved embassy security abroad. The obvious and express purpose of this provision is to develop improved security at our embassy facilities, and thus decrease the danger factor for Americans in diplomatic service. This represents a sound and urgently needed investment of funds. It embodies much of what was contained in the authorization bill which I was proud to cosponsor.

A second important provision in this legislation relates to the $50 million provided for the so-called Anglo-Irish fund. In reality, this is the first installment of what we hope will be a full $250 million commitment of first time United States economic aid for Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland over 5 years.

I am proud to have been the author of the first piece of legislation ever introduced to provide economic aid to

the six beleaguered counties of northeast Ireland. I sponsored my first bill in 1983. I am delighted we have reached this juncture today. It is obvious to many of my colleagues that this issue took on new light and energy due to the signing of the so-called Anglo-Irish Agreement between Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland. While I continue to have serious reservations about this agreement as a vehicle to achieve a lasting solution in Northern Ireland, it is a step forward, albeit a fragile one.

I have long contended that economic aid is in fact the real catalyst to bring about a lasting solution in Northern Ireland. My reasons for this are simple: Northern Ireland has the highest unemployment rate of any nation in western Europe at 21.3 percent. This burden has fallen the hardest on the Catholic minority in the north. For example in the city of Newry, unemployment among Catholics is in excess of 60 percent. In Strabane, it is over 50 percent. Some families are entering a second and third generation of unemployment, poverty and despair.

If I have any reservations about this aid, it involves the lack of explicit assurances that this aid will be governed by the conditions made a part of the authorization bill, H.R. 4329. I am proud to have worked closely in the development of these conditions, which I consider to be absolutely vital if this aid is to be used in a fashion to contribute to improvements, as compared to maintaining the status quo. At this point in my statement, I am inserting these conditions.

SEC. 4. CONDITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) PROMOTING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT.—The United States contributions provided for in this Act may be used only to support and promote economic and social reconstruction and redevelopment in Ireland and Northern Ireland. The restrictions contained in sections 531(e) and 660(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 apply with respect to any such contributions.

(b) UNITED STATES REPRESENTATION ON THE BOARD OF THE FUND.—The President shall make every effort, in consultation with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Ireland, to ensure that there is United States representation on the Board of the International Fund.

(c) PRIOR CERTIFICATIONS.—Each fiscal year, the United States may make contributions to the International Fund only if the President certifies to the Congress that he is satisfied that—

(1) the Board of the Fund, as a whole, is broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland; and

(2) disbursements from the Fund—

(A) will be distributed in accordance with the principle of equality of opportunity and nondiscrimination in employment, without regard to religious affiliation; and

(B) will address the needs of both communities in Northern Ireland.

Each such certification shall include a detailed explanation of the basis for the President's decision.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORTS.

At the end of each fiscal year in which the United States Government makes contributions to the International Fund, the President shall report to the Congress on the degree to which—

(1) the Fund has contributed to reconciliation between the communities in Northern Ireland;

(2) the United States contribution to the Fund is meeting its objectives of encouraging new investment, job creation, and economic reconstruction on the basis of strict equality of opportunity; and

(3) the Fund has increased respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all people in Ireland and Northern Ireland.

My concern is, since the Senate has yet to complete action on their authorization bill, the appropriations we adopt as part of this conference report may not be subject to these conditions. I therefore call on the Senate to complete action at once on the authorizing bill. It is my understanding that they are prepared to accept most if not all of the House conditions, but time is of the essence.

The fact is, with the passage of this bill, we are taking a major step forward on an issue which few felt would ever reach this point. I have been serving as chairman of the ad hoc congressional committee since it was founded in 1977. Today it has 114 members of a bipartisan basis. One of our longstanding concerns was the future of Northern Ireland and what steps would be needed to help bring peace and justice to that land. Often the steps led to economic aid. We are one step closer to making this a reality. Adoption of this conference report is important.

The final area of support I wish to address that is part of this bill is the language providing an additional appropriation of $8.5 million for the Elderly Feeding Program under the Department of Agriculture. This is a key component of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Program. Under this program, nutrition programs are given the choice between commodities and cash in lieu of commodities to expand their meal services. States are in turn reimbursed based on the total number of meals they serve under title III.

A serious problem developed last year when the Department of Agriculture suddenly reduced the rate by 3 cents a meal. This action came after States and nutrition programs had planned their budgets based on the 56.76-cent reimbursement rate. The choices they face are not good ones. They could reduce their meals outright, or borrow against their fiscal year 1986 allocation to maintain services. Either way the loser is the elderly participant. In terms of numbers it is estimated that for every 1 cent that the reimbursement rate is lowered, it leads to a loss of 700,000 meals nationally. Therefore a 3-cent-a-meal reduction means over 2 million meals.

Legislation was passed by the House and Senate that I was proud to author lifting the authorization "cap" that had been imposed on this program to allow the funds necessary to settle past due claims from last fiscal year to be honored. However, the Department of Agriculture, on the advice of the Office of Management and Budget, has elected not to release the $7 million in funds for that purpose but rather to maintain the reimbursement rate at 56.76 cents for this entire fiscal year.

This conference report once again addresses this issue and provides for a new appropriation of $8.5 million. According to its sponsor in the other body, roughly $7 million of this would settle the past due claims and the remaining $1.5 million would go to preserve the rate at 56.76 cents for this year.

It is vital these funds are released before further chaos envelopes this all-important program. I commend the House conferees for accepting this amendment and wish to commend my colleague Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT for authoring a letter to the conferees which I was proud to cosign. I also wish to salute the outstanding advocacy efforts of two national organizations, the National Association of Nutrition and Aging Service Programs and the National Association of Meal Programs. They have kept the pressure on the Congress to address this very real problem, and I hope with the adopting of this conference report we have done just that.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the White House has signed off on today's conference report, I intend to oppose its adoption.

To be sure, there are many deserving programs that need prompt release of money contained in this bill. However, this report contains too much fat along with some necessary funding.

I generally dislike supplementals, because they typically hold necessary funding for vital programs hostage to force adoption of unwise spending practices. This conference report, while an improvement over the original House bill, nonetheless remains burdened with unnecessary expenditures that could be further reduced from conference level.

I am particularly disappointed with the bill's failure to exert some control over runaway expenses for the congressional franking privilege. As usual, our election year mailing costs are running extremely high due to mass mailings designed to keep Members' names in the minds of their constituents. In this bill, we could have established new rules to limit the political abuse of the frank. We did not.

Mr. Speaker, the bill still contains too much money for not enough good reasons. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Mr. BOLAND.Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report on the Urgent Sup-

plemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986 and urge its adoption by the House.

I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to a provision in the conference report that I believe is especially important. One of the best investments this country makes is in the education of its children. And among the best programs Congress has ever created are those that expand the availability of a college education. The bill presently under consideration by the House provides $146 million for the Pell Grant Program, a program that I have enthusiastically supported since its inception. These additional funds will make it possible for 100,000 students, who could not otherwise make use of the program, to receive Pell grants. The potential benefit to our country's future from making the opportunity of higher education available on the basis of merit, rather than means, is incalculable. I believe it is therefore imperative that we continue to provide the maximum possible assistance to programs like the Pell grants, and I am pleased that is the course charted by the legislation now before us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to provide a summary of the HUD-Independent Agencies provisions in this bill. Chapter VI includes a number of urgent items for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies. First, there are three rescissions of housing funds totalling $6.9 billion. These rescissions do not, however, reduce the number of housing units provided. They simply reflect the conversions from the old rent supplement and rental housing assistance programs to the section 8 program—and also the accounting change in public housing development to direct financing.

In addition, chapter VI overturns the five deferrals proposed for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This includes the $500 million deferred for the Community Development Block Grant Program and $2.3 billion for annual contributions for assisted housing.

I think everyone is well aware of the problems the Federal Housing Administration fund has been having. Since June 6 no FHA loan commitments have been made. This chapter addresses two problems within the FHA Program. First, it increases the limitation on loans by $57,580 million. This should provide sufficient ceiling to continue the program through September 30, 1986. In addition, the Secretary's authority to make FHA loan commitments is extended until July 25.

With respect to EPA's sewage treatment construction grants program, the conference agreement would provide for the release of an additional $1.2 billion. Even though the Clean Water Act has not yet been reauthorized, about 25 States have run out of money and the conferees felt it was essential that we make these funds available. However, the final $600 million appropriated will not be made available until after the program has been reauthorized.

For the FEMA disaster relief program, we provide an additional $250 million. The disaster relief fund has virtually run out of money so these funds are urgently needed and should address all current problems as well as anticipated disasters over the remainder of the fiscal year.

This chapter also provides supplemental funds for NASA to correct the problems with the shuttle solid rocket boosters. Four hundred and thirty-one million dollars is provided as a 1986 supplemental and an additional $100 million is appropriated for 1987, but the 1987 funds will be available only after NASA has certified that they are implementing the recommendations of the Rogers Commission.

This chapter also has a number of provisions dealing with the Veterans' Administration. A transfer is permitted up to $30 million to medical care to maintain the current staffing level of 193,941 FTE. And, $35 million is provided for veterans job training, to be available until September 1988. A number of transfers are also provided for HUD, EPA, NASA, and the Veterans' Administration to take care of shortfalls in operating accounts.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 52, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—355

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Barnard
Barnes
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bedell
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Chappie
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lundine
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Oxley
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—52

Archer
Armey
Bartlett
Bilirakis
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Cheney
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
DeWine
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Fields
Frenzel
Goodling
Gregg
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hertel
Hughes
Leath (TX)
Lewis (FL)
Loeffler
Lott
Lungren
Mack
McCandless
McCollum
Monson
Moorhead
Nielson
Packard
Penny
Ray
Roemer
Russo
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Smith, Denny (OR)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Smith, Robert (NH) | Stenholm | Vucanovich |
| Solomon | Stump | Walker |
| | Swindall | Wirth |

NOT VOTING—26

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bentley | Grotberg | O'Brien |
| Breaux | Huckaby | Owens |
| Campbell | Kemp | Rodino |
| Collins | LaFalce | Shumway |
| Dowdy | Lujan | Sikorski |
| Eckert (NY) | Luken | Weaver |
| Fowler | McKinney | Wilson |
| Franklin | Miller (CA) | Wolpe |
| Gephardt | Nichols | |

□ 1735

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Sikorski for, with Mr. Nichols against.

Messrs. MOORHEAD, LOEFFLER, BILIRAKIS, SHUSTER, HERTEL of Michigan, CRAIG, and LEWIS of Florida changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. IRELAND and Mr. COBEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONNELLY). The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

□ 1745

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 9, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 48, 55, 58, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 86, 88, 94, 99, 103, 113, 125, 133, 138, 140, 153, 158, 159, 160, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 198, 206, 207, 208, 211, 214, 221, 222 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the foregoing request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, lines 14 and 15, strike out "$10,000,000 to remain available until expended" and insert "$9,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed a total of $1,000,000 of this amount may be transferred to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and the Food Safety and Inspection Service for contamination testing: *Provided further*, That the remaining $8,000,000 shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 6, after line 6, insert:

EXCLUSION OF PERMAFROST SOILS FROM DEFINITION OF "WETLAND"

Section 1201(a)(16) of Public Law 99-198 (99 Stat. 1505) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "For purposes of this Act, and any other Act, this term shall not include lands in Alaska identified as having high potential for agricultural development which have a predominance of permafrost soils.".

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 6, after line 26, insert:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations, research, and facilities" to maintain public warning and forecast services and aircraft services, $10,822,000, to remain available until expended.

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service", $2,600,000.

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions, $3,000,000.

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" for the relocation within the District of Columbia of the Washington field office, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Of available funds provided under this head in Public Law 98-166 and Public Law 99-88 for the relocation within the District of Columbia of the Washington field office, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

The limitation in Public Law 99-180 on the receipts credited to this appropriation from fees collected to process fingerprint identification records for noncriminal employment and licensing purposes is increased by $1,000,000.

Senate amendment No. 36: Page 7, after line 1, insert:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $3,000,000.

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 7, after line 5, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 8, line 3, strike out all after "expended:" down to and including "Sales" in line 9, and insert *Provided*, That such funds shall become available for obligation on September 30, 1986".

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 10, after line 15, insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106(b)(1) of the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984, a bankruptcy judge serving on a part-time basis on the date of enactment of this Act may continue to serve as a part-time judge for such district until December 31, 1986, or until such time as a full-time bankruptcy judge for such district is appointed, whichever is earlier: *Provided*, That these provisions shall apply only to part-time bankruptcy judges serving in the district of Oregon, the western district of Michigan, and the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 11, line 6, after "expended" insert ": *Provided*, That notwithstanding the proviso under this head in Public Law 99-88, and notwithstanding section 8(b) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, as amended, the amounts placed in reserve, or which would have been placed in reserve, in fiscal year 1985 pursuant to that section shall be available to the Board for grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty".

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", $3,900,000 to be derived by transfer from "Acquisition and Construction of Radio Facilities", to remain available until expended.

The limitation in Public Law 99-180 on the receipts credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from or in connection with English-teaching programs is increased by $175,000.

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The limitation for real property maintenance contained under the head "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps" in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, 99 Stat. 1189, is amended by striking "$238,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$223,200,000".

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

TENTH INTERNATIONAL PAN AMERICAN GAMES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Tenth International Pan American Games", $8,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1987.

Of available funds provided under this head in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, 99 Stat. 1192, $8,000,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this head in Public Law 98-212, $34,400,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this head in Public Law 98-212, $40,100,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

COASTAL DEFENSE AUGMENTATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of the amounts available to the Department of Defense for "Coastal Defense Augmentation", $21,250,000 shall be transferred to Coast Guard "Acquisition, construction and improvements".

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The last proviso under the head "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force", in the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, Public Law 99-190, is amended by striking "July 1, 1986" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 1, 1986".

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Missile Procurement, Air Force", $16,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1986/1988", to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1988, and in addition $329,400,000 shall be derived by transfer as provided for by Section 8103 of Public Law 99-190 as amended in this act.

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this head in Public Law 98-473, $40,000,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force", $84,386,000, to be derived by transfer from "Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 1986/1988", to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1987, and in addition $232,500,000 shall be derived by transfer as provided for by section 8103 of Public Law 99-190 as amended in this Act.

Senate amendment No. 74: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

ADP EQUIPMENT MANAGEMENT FUNDS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "ADP Equipment Management Fund", $100,000,000, to remain available for obligation until expended.

Of available funds provided under this head in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, 99 Stat. 1202, $100,000,000 are rescinded.

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 12, line 2, after "Washington" insert ": *Provided further,* That using available funds, the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $8,200,000 to initiate construction of the Cooper River seismic modification project in South Carolina".

Senate amendment No. 88: Page 12, after line 12, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The authority to acquire new buildings and facilities, including necessary real estate, for the United States Army Engineer District, Walla Walla, Washington, as provided for in Public Law 99-88, 99 Stat. 293, 316, may be implemented by lease purchase contract or by any other appropriate means.

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 14, after line 13, insert:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ANTI-TERRORISM ASSISTANCE

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $2,739,000, to be derived by transfer from any of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in titles I, II, III, and IV of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190).

Senate amendment No. 99: Page 15, after line 7, insert:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Direct loan authority made available in title IV of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190) for the Export-Import Bank of the United States is available through September 30, 1987.

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 16, after line 3, insert:

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION FUND

The applicable limitation on additional commitments to insure mortgages and loans to carry out the purposes of the National Housing Act during fiscal year 1986 is increased by an additional $57,580,000,000 of mortgage and loan principal.

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

The applicable limitation on new commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act during fiscal year 1986 is increased by an additional $49,000,000,000 of principal.

Senate amendment No. 113: Page 18, after line 18, insert:

Notwithstanding section 409 of Public Law 99-160, of the funds provided by that Act for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, an additional $250,000 may be used for object classification expenses other than personnel compensation and benefits.

Senate amendment No. 125: Page 20, line 8, after "1996" insert ": *Provided,* That none of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to drain lakes in Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area prior to approval by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 97-942".

Senate amendment No. 133: Page 21, after line 13, insert:

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

Public Law 99-190 (99 Stat. 1237) is amended under this heading by deleting the word "may" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the word "shall" and by adding the following new proviso before the period: ": *Provided further,* That the United States secure a lien in the amount of the principal and interest of the loan upon trust or other funds of the tribe including any net recovery the tribe may receive from any final award of judgment against the United States which may be rendered in favor of the Zuni Indian Tribe in Docket Numbers 161-79L and 327-81L presently pending before the United States Claims Court".

Senate amendment No. 138: Page 22, line 6, after "239" insert ", and as may be authorized upon the enactment of S.J. Res. 325 or similar legislation".

Senate amendment No. 140: Page 22, after line 14, insert:

Funds appropriated in this Act, under the terms of Public Law 99-239, the Compact of Free Association, for Kwajalein impact payments to the Republic of the Marshall Islands may be used to reimburse the Department of the Army for interim use payments made by the Department of the Army since October 1, 1985.

Senate amendment No. 153: Page 25, after line 2, insert:

ALTERNATIVE FUELS PRODUCTION

For the repayment of principal and interest on notes issued to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to the provisions of section 19(n)(4) of the Federal Non-nuclear Energy Research and Development Act, Public Law 93-577, as amended by Public Law 95-238, $1,020,360,322, together with such additional sums as may be necessary, for the payment of interest which shall have accrued to the date final principal payment is made.

Senate amendment No. 158: Page 25, after line 18, insert:

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

Senate amendment No. 159: Page 25, after line 18, insert:

For an additional amount for the Health Resources and Services Administration to carry out the provisions of section 1910 of the Public Health Service Act (pertaining to Emergency Medical Services for Children), $2,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1987.

Senate amendment No. 160: Page 25, after line 18, insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall immediately renew all designated agreements and contracts in accordance with title 15 of the Public Health Service Act for such periods after September 30, 1986 as each Agency's budget, including unobligated Federal funds available for carryover, permits.

Senate amendment No. 165: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

None of the funds appropriated in this Act, or in any other Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1986, may be used to implement any regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Education after March 31, 1986, to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 30, 1950, relating to impact aid, if such regulations are to take effect during the fiscal year 1986.

Senate amendment No. 166: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

The first sentence of section 3(d)(2)(B) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "increase the amount" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "increase the actual payment to be made pursuant to the amount".

Section 3(d)(2)(B) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "In carrying out the provisions of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall count the actual number of children with respect to such agency for each fiscal year under subsection (b) without regard to the provisions of subparagraph (E) of this paragraph.".

Senate amendment No. 167: Page 21, after line 18, insert:

The Secretary shall, in making any audit of payments made under the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) accept the manner of counting children attending kindergarten for the pur-

pose of that Act if the manner of counting such children is in accordance with State law.

Senate amendment No. 170: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

Notwithstanding the notice relating to applications for pinpoint disaster assistance (43 Federal Register 57194 (1978)) or any other provision of Federal law or regulation, the Secretary of Education shall accept an application from Preston County Board of Education, West Virginia, under section 16 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) filed after the date of enactment of this Act.

Senate amendment No. 171: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Hays-Lodge Pole School District Number 50 of Hays, Montana, is relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $181,557.13, together with any interest on such sum, representing interest earned on investments which were made from payments made under the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) for a construction project initiated in 1975, and which were made after consulting with Federal officials. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

Senate amendment No. 173: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act, as amended, $146,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1987.

Senate amendment No. 174: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

RELATED AGENCIES

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Provided prior approval is obtained from the Committees on Appropriations, an additional amount not to exceed $1,241,000 for "Operation and Maintenance", may be transferred from the Soldiers' and Airmen's "Capital Outlay" fund.

Senate amendment No. 183: Page 28, line 9, after "$35,500,000." insert "In addition, $10,400,000 shall be transferred from "Coast Guard, Acquisition, construction and improvements" pursuant to section 5(a) of Public Law 98-557.".

Senate amendment No. 188: Page 28, after line 26, insert:

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING AND DEVELOPMENT (AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Research, engineering and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)", $72,220,000, of which $17,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the unobligated balance of "Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)" and to remain available until September 30, 1989, and of which $55,220,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)" and to remain available until September 30, 1990.

Senate amendment No. 189: Page 28, after line 26, insert:

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

The Department of Transportation is authorized to expend $5,000,000 from the emergency relief fund established by section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for the purposes of preventing the continuing flooding of Interstate 80 by the rising waters of the Great Salt Lake.

Senate amendment No. 190: Page 28, after line 26, insert:

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

REDEEMABLE PREFERENCE SHARES

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Transportation shall, until September 30, 1988, issue and sell, and the Secretary of the Treasury until such date shall purchase, Fund anticipation notes, and the Secretary of Transportation is hereby authorized to expend for uses authorized for the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Fund proceeds from the sale of such Fund anticipation notes and any other moneys deposited in the Fund after September 30, 1985, pursuant to sections 502, 505-507, and 509 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-210), as amended, and section 803 of Public Law 95-620, in amounts not to exceed $33,500,000.

Senate amendment No. 191: Page 28, after line 26, insert:

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

FORMULA GRANTS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, urbanized areas which became urbanized areas for the first time under the 1980 census shall be entitled to utilize, from funds apportioned to them under section 9 of the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act, as amended, the same amount of funds for operating assistance in fiscal year 1986 as was available to them in fiscal year 1985.

Senate amendment No. 194: Page 29, after line 8, insert:

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

Of the total amount previously appropriated and made available under this head in Public Law 99-190, $6,000,000 shall be obligated and remain available until expended for dormitory construction.

Senate amendment No. 198: Page 30, after line 4, insert:

SEC. 3. The Internal Revenue Service shall provide on a non-reimbursable basis, all necessary data processing support to the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms to assist in the implementation of a new Special Occupational Tax Compliance system at the Bureau.

Senate amendment No. 206: Page 30, after line 20, insert:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

(LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE)

In addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1986, $3,500,000 shall be made available until expended for the construction and acquisition of facilities as follows:

New Construction:

South Carolina: Charleston, Post Office and Courthouse Annex, $3,500,000:

*Provided*, That for additional expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the fund established pursuant to section 210(f) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(f)), $3,500,000 to be deposited into said fund: *Provided further*, That any revenues, collections, and any other sums accruing to this fund in excess of $2,415,501,000, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)) shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

Senate amendment No. 207: Page 30, after line 20 insert:

GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The annual limitation of $5,200,000 through September 30, 1989 under this heading in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985, Public Law 99-88, for expenses of transportation audit contracts and contract administration is increased to $7,600,000 for fiscal year 1986.

Senate amendment No. 208: Page 30, after line 20, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Administrator of General Service is authorized and directed to convey, for the sum of one dollar, to the City of Santa Fe, New Mexcio, all right, title, and interest of the United States in the parcel of surplus property known as the Burns Hospital Site more specifically being the property designated with GSA Control Number for Disposal Purposes 7-G-NM-403, parcels F and H, consisting of approximately 4.37 acres, such property being a portion of the same property which the City of Santa Fe conveyed to the Department of the Army in 1944 for the amount of one dollar.

Senate amendment No. 211: Page 30, after line 20, insert:

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Personnel Management in implementing the provisions of the Federal Employees' Retirement Systems Act of 1986, as authorized by section 207(j) of such Act, not to exceed $2,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, to be in addition to funds previously made available to the Office of Personnel Management from such Fund.

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 31, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 202. For purposes of implementing the President's February 1, 1986 order under Public Law 99-177, the percentage reduction required for payments made pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1012; 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1; 42 U.S.C. 6508; and Public Law 96-586, 94 Stat. 3381, 2(d) (2) and (3) shall be the same percentage reduction as required for all nondefense accounts.

Senate amendment No. 221: Page 33, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 209. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available for any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training in connection with the growth or production in a foreign country of an agricultural commodity for export which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit (1) activities designed to increase food security in developing countries where such activities will not have a significant

impact on the export of agricultural commodities of the United States; or (2) research activities intended primarily to benefit American producers.

Senate amendment No. 222: Page 33, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no reduction in the amount of funds for which the City of New York, New York, is eligible under any Federal law, or to which the City of New York, New York, is entitled under any Federal law, may be made, and

(2) no other penalty may be imposed by the Federal Government.

by reason of the application of New York City Local Law 19 of 1985 to any contract entered into by the City of New York before October 1, 1986, which is funded in whole, or in part, with funds provided by the Federal Government.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 48, 55, 58, 60, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 86, 88, 94, 99, 103, 113, 125, 133, 138, 140, 153, 158, 159, 160, 165, 166, 167, 170, 171, 173, 174, 183, 188, 189, 190, 191, 194, 198, 206, 207, 208, 211, 214, 221 and 222 and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, after line 17, insert:

During fiscal year 1986, and within the resources and authority available, obligations for direct loans and related advances pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, shall not exceed $9,855,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

During fiscal year 1986, and within the resources and authority available, obligations for direct loans and related advances pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, shall not exceed $11,335,000.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 3, after line 17, insert:

For loans for acquisition and development of building sites for mutual and self-help housing, $1,500,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND

For loans for acquisition and development of building sites for mutual and self-help housing, $1,000,000.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 4, strike out lines 11 to 15.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offered a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

FEEDING PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For an additional amount, for the special supplemental food program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $20,000,000, to be distributed to the States under the existing fiscal year 1986 growth formula.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 4, after line 22, insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not to exceed $5,300,000,000 for capital restoration, to enable the Corporation to use the authority authorized by the Charter of the Corporation and other laws to carry out programs handled by the Corporation: *Provided*, That, during fiscal year 1986, the Corporation shall use not less than $4,000,000 worth of surplus agricultural commodities owned by the Corporation in establishing and carrying out a research and development program on external combustion engines under section 4(m) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended by the Food Security Improvements Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-260, approved March 20, 1986).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, not to exceed $5,300,000,000 for capital restoration, to enable the Corporation to use the authority authorized by the Charter of the Corporation and other laws to carry out programs handled by the Corporation.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to ask a question: in considering this amount for the Commodity Credit Corporation, are we now confident that that amount will get us through the rest of the year? Is that a fair assumption at this point?

Mr. CONTE. I would have to tell the gentleman "No."

Mr. WALKER. Do we have any idea at this point how much additional money we might have to come back for?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman address his question to this gentleman?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts or the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CONTE. Let me say this: the $5.3 billion will make a total of $24.988 billion. Moreover, with the new farm

bill, the dairy buyout and everything else, they could be up here again before it is all over with.

Mr. WALKER. Before September 30.

Mr. CONTE. Before September 30.

Mr. WALKER. Do we have any idea how much more they could be in for?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that the Commodity Credit Corporation has various obligations that we cannot anticipate what will be required. This is the full amount requested. Two billion dollars of this is to pay the interest to the Treasury on loans made to the CCC. There are certain provisions in the agriculture law that we passed this year that are such that we cannot tell you what may occur later, but this is all they see at this time that they need. We gave them every dollar they asked for.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 5, strike out lines 17 to 24.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

The Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer $5,000,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Cooperative State Research Service to meet the matching funds requirement for development of an international trade center at Oklahoma State University.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 6, after line 6, insert:

DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

(a) Effective only for the 1986 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make deficiency payments to producers on a farm under section 107D(c)(1), 105C(c)(1), 103A(c)(1), or 101A(c)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445b-3(c)(1), 1444e(c)(1), 1444-1(c)(1), or 1441-1(c)(1)), as the case may be, if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the producers on a farm are prevented from planting any portion of the acreage intended for a commodity to the commodity or other nonconserving crops because of flood, heavy rains, or excessive moisture; and

(2) the farm is located in an area that the Secretary determines has been substantially affected by a natural disaster in the United States or by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) The amount of deficiency payments under subsection (a) shall be computed by multiplying—

(1) 40 percent of the projected payment rate; by

(2) the number of acres so affected but not to exceed the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest (including any acreage that the producers were prevented from planting to the commodity or other nonconserving crops in lieu of the commodity because of flood, heavy rains, or excessive moisture) in the immediately preceding year; by

(3) the farm program payment yield established for the crop for the farm.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS

(a) Effective only for the 1986 crop of wheat, feed grains, upland cotton, and rice, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make deficiency payments to producers on a farm under section 107D(c)(1), 105C(c)(1), 103A(c)(1), or 101A(c)(1) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445b-3(c)(1), 1444e(c)(1), 1444-1(c)(1), or 1441-1(c)(1)), as the case may be, if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the producers on a farm are prevented from planting any portion of the acreage intended for a commodity to the commodity or other nonconserving crops because of flood, heavy rains, excessive moisture, or drought; and

(2) the farm is located in an area that the Secretary determines has been substantially affected by a natural disaster in the United States or by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Disaster Relief Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

(b) The amount of deficiency payments under subsection (a) shall be computed by multiplying—

(1) 40 percent of the projected payment rate; by

(2) the number of acres so affected but not to exceed the acreage planted to the commodity for harvest (including any acreage that the producers were prevented from planting to the commodity or other nonconserving crops in lieu of the commodity because of flood, heavy rains, excessive moisture, or drought) in the immediately preceding year; by

(3) the farm program payment yield established for the crop for the farm.

(c) Such sums shall be deducted from crop insurance indemnity payments due as a result of such disaster.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 6, after line 6, insert:

PREPAYMENT OF LOANS BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

In the case of a borrower of a loan made by the Federal Financing Bank, and guaranteed by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, under section 306 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 936) that is outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act, the borrower may prepay the loan by payment of the outstanding principal balance due on the loan using private capital with the existing loan guarantee. No sums in addition to payment of such balance shall be charged as the result of such prepayment against the borrower, the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund established under section 301 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 931), or the Rural Electrification Administration.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

PREPAYMENT OF LOANS BY RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE SYSTEMS

In the case of a borrower of a loan made by the Federal Financing Bank, and guaranteed by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, under section 306 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 936) that is outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act, the borrower may prepay the loan by payment of the outstanding principal balance due on the loan using private capital with the existing loan guarantee. No sums in addition to payment of such balance shall be charged as the result of such prepayment against the borrower, the Rural Electrification and Telephone Revolving Fund established

under section 301 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 931), or the Rural Electrification Administration. To qualify for prepayment, a borrower shall certify that such prepayment will result in substantial savings to its customers or lessen the threat of bankruptcy of the borrower unless in such individual case, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, to prepay would adversely affect the operation of the Federal Financing Bank: *Provided*, That any regulations under this provision shall be issued and become effective within 30 days of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: Page 6, after line 6, insert:

ELDERLY FEEDING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for reimbursement at a level of 56.76 cents per meal during fiscal years 1985 and 1986, determined under section 311(a)(4) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a(a)(4)), for meals served under section 311 of such Act in such fiscal years, $8,500,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That such funds shall be derived by transfer from funds previously appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture; subject to the prior approval of the Appropriation Committees: *Provided further*, That such transfer of funds shall be sufficient to reduce by $8,000,000 fiscal year 1986 outlays which would otherwise occur in the account or accounts from which such funds are transferred.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

ELDERLY FEEDING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for reimbursement at a level of 56.76 cents per meal during fiscal years 1985 and 1986, determined under section 311(a)(4) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030a(a)(4)), for meals served under section 311 of such Act in such fiscal years, $8,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 6, after line 26, insert:

Upon the request of the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority, Seattle, Washington, the Secretary of Commerce shall authorize the sale or lease to any person of the Fairley Group Building (project numbers 07-01-01890, as modified by 07-01-01890.01, and 07-11-02606) located in the Pike Place Market, King County, Washington, without affecting the Federal assistance provided under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, if the transfer documents provide for the continued use of the Fairley Group Building as a public market during the expected useful life of the building.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Upon the request of the Pike Place Market Preservation and Development Authority, Seattle, Washington, the Secretary of Commerce shall authorize the sale or lease to any person of the Fairley Group Building (project numbers 07-01-01890, as modified by 07-01-01890.01, and 07-11-02606) located in the Pike Place Market, King County, Washington, without affecting the Federal assistance provided under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, if the transfer documents provide for the continued use of the Fairley Group Building as a public market during the expected useful life of the building: *Provided*, That the provisions of 13 CFR 314.4 and OMB Circular A-102 Attachment N are hereby waived so long as the Fairley Group Building remains in the control of the public authority and is used as a public market during the expected useful life of the building.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 7, after line 5, insert:

Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in title II of Public Law 99-180, not to exceed $500,000 may be transferred to "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" to pay expenses related to the activities of any Independent Counsel appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 591, et seq. upon notification by the Attorney General to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in Public Law 99-180, not to exceed $150,000 from "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses," not to exceed $150,000 from "Salaries and Expenses, Antitrust Division," not to exceed $100,000 from Emergency Assistance in "Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance," and not to exceed $100,000 from the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program in "Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance," may be transferred to "Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities" to pay expenses related to the activities of any Independent Counsel appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 591, et seq.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 7, after line 5, insert:

MODEL STATE STATUTE

SECTION 1. ATTORNEY GENERAL TO DEVELOP MODEL STATUTE.

The Attorney General as Chairman of the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board, in consultation with State and local law enforcement agencies, shall develop a model statute for States to prohibit the establishment and use of freebase houses.

SEC. 2. GOALS AND CONTENT OF MODEL STATUTE.

(a) GOALS OF MODEL STATUTE.—The model statute developed pursuant to section 1 shall—

(1) address the need to prohibit the use of houses, buildings, rooms, or apartments as places where manufacturing, processing, distributing, purchasing, and using illegal drugs takes place; and

(2) encourage coordination with the Controlled Substances Act, statutes on drug paraphernalia, and other relevant drug law enforcement statutes.

(b) CONTENT.—(1) The model statute shall clearly—

(A) define a freebase house and activities which take place in such dwellings;

(B) define the offenses which take place in such freebase houses;

(C) define penalties for such offenses; and

(D) allow for civil seizure and forfeiture of property confiscated in such offenses.

(2) The model statute shall include prohibitions—

(A) making it illegal for a person to own or operate a freebase house;

(B) making it illegal for a person to work in a freebase house which includes managing, selling drugs, collecting fees and admission, processing or preparing drugs, distributing drugs, or contributing to the overall drug enterprises in the dwelling with a knowledge of or having reason to believe that illegal drugs are present on the premises;

(C) making it illegal for a person to frequent a freebase house with knowledge or reason to believe that illegal drugs are present on the premises; and

(D) making it illegal for employers, employees, and customers to be present in freebase houses when they have knowledge or have reason to believe that drugs are on the premises.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Attorney General shall include with the model statute recommendations for procedures to allow law enforcement officials to notify owners and managers of dwellings where freebasing and drug distribution is taking place.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS AND STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES.

The Attorney General shall—

(1) develop the model statute and recommendations required by this Act within six months after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) make the report and recommendations available to the appropriate committees of Congress and to State and local law enforcement authorities in his capacity as Chairman of the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board.

SEC. 4. DEFINITION OF FREEBASING.

For purposes of this Act, the term "freebasing" is the conversion of cocaine crystals into a smokable base form of the drug.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

NATIONAL ASSISTANCE PLAN TO HALT ROCK AND CRACK COCAINE TRAFFICKING

The Attorney General as Chairman of the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is directed to convene the Board to address on an emergency basis the crisis phenomenon that cocaine freebase, "rock" and "crack" cocaine, have caused in communities throughout the nation.

Within 60 days of enactment, the Board is directed to report to the Congress and to develop and implement a national plan of assistance to state and local governments to halt trafficking in rock and crack cocaine; to promote effective law enforcement efforts to identify, investigate, prosecute and incarcerate perpetrators engaged in enterprises involving rock and crack cocaine; and, to foster public understanding of the dangerous effects of this substance on public health and safety.

This plan of assistance shall concentrate on methods of using existing laws in such areas as conspiracy, aiding and abetting, forfeiture, possession and trafficking to address this drug with its special potency and distribution characteristics, including the use of rock or freebase houses where the cocaine freebase is processed, distributed, and smoked. The Board's plan should also address those areas where existing law should be amended to strengthen enforcement and prosecution against rock and crack cocaine.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 7, lines 12 and 13, strike out [$237,494,000, to remain available until September 30, 1987] and insert "$288,047,000, to remain available until expended".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$283,104,000, to remain available until expended".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: Page 7, line 13, strike out all after "1987:" down to and including "Sales" in line 19, and insert "*Provided*, That such funds shall become available for obligation on September 30, 1986".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

*Provided*, That $222,104,000 of this amount shall become available for obligation on September 30, 1986".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 9, strike out lines 3 to 15.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISION—DIPLOMATIC SECURITY PROGRAM

The funds made available by this chapter to the Department of State under the headings "Salaries and Expenses", "'Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad", and "Counterterrorism Research and Development" shall not be used for any purpose inconsistent with or contrary to authorizing legislation for the Diplomatic Security Program as enacted into law.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 10, after line 15, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Not to exceed 10 per centum of any appropriation made available in title IV of Public Law 99-180 may be transferred to any other appropriation in title IV of Public Law 99-180.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Of the funds made available in title IV of Public Law 99-180, not to exceed $8,000,000 from "Expenses of Operation and Maintenance of the Courts" may be transferred to "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" and not to exceed $500,000 from "Expenses of Operation and Maintenance of the Courts" and not to exceed $2,500,000 from "Salaries of Judges" may be transferred to "Space and Facilities".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 18006(b) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 is amended by striking out all that follows "on account of disasters" and inserting in lieu thereof "which occurred prior to October 1, 1985, and with respect to which a disaster declaration application was submitted prior to October 1, 1985.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker. I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATION PROVISION

Section 18006(b) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 is amended by striking out "declared before October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "which occurred prior to October 1, 1985, and with respect to which a disaster declaration application was submitted prior to October 1, 1985".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 77: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 2. Section 8051 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, 99 Stat. 1211, is amended 1) by striking out "Army, Navy, and Air Force" and 2) by striking out the proviso and in lieu thereof inserting: *"Provided*, That such transfers shall not exceed $678,700,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army; $1,301,600,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy; $30,100,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps; $608,700,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force; $82,000,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies; $19,300,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve; $47,600,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve; $4,200,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve; $14,400,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve; $42,100,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard; and $35,400,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. Section 8051 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, 99 Stat. 1211, is amended by striking out "Army, Navy, and Air Force" and by striking out the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof: *"Provided*, That such transfers shall not exceed $678,700,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army; $1,301,600,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy; $30,100,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps; $608,700,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force; $24,300,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies; $19,300,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve; $47,600,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve; $4,200,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve; $14,400,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve; $42,100,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard; and $35,400,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 78: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 3. Section 8037 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, is amended by adding "Titan 34D7 Complementary Expendable Launch Vehicles" at the end thereof.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of "SEC. 3." named in said amendment, insert the following: "SEC. 2".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 4. Sec. 8103 of the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, Public Law 99-190, is amended as follows: in subsection (b) inserting "the Complementary Expendable Launch Vehicle Program," directly following "and the Coastal Defense Augmentation Account,"; and inserting a new provision at the end of subsection (b) as follows: ": *Provided further*, That $561,900,000 for the Complementary Expendable Launch Vehicle Program shall be so available without notification procedures otherwise required by this subsection".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 3. Section 8103 of the fiscal year 1986 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, Public Law 99-190, is amended as follows: in subsection (b) insert "the Department of Defense Space Recovery Program, the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services," directly following "and the Coastal Defense Augmentation account,"; and insert a new provision at the end of subsection (b) before the period, as follows, ":*Provided further*, That $260,000,000 for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services shall be available without notification procedures otherwise required by this subsection".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 80: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 5. Of the amounts available to the Department of Defense, $5,000,000 shall be available for such claims arising from property losses caused by the explosion of Army munitions near Checotah, Oklahoma, on August 4, 1985, and claims determined by the Department to be bona fide shall be paid from the funds made available by this section.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 4. Of the amounts available to the Department of Defense, $5,000,000 shall be available for such claims arising from property losses caused by the explosion of Army munitions near Checotah, Oklahoma, on August 4, 1985, and claims determined by the Department to be bona fide shall be paid from the funds made available by this section.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

SEC. 6. Of the appropriations available to the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year, $3,000,000, in addition to the appropriation "National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army", may be used to conduct the 1986 National Matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, and such ammunition as may be necessary shall be made available for the matches.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the "SEC. 6" named in said amendment, insert the following: "SEC. 5".

Mr. CONTE. (during the reading). Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 11, after line 14, insert:

CHAPTER III A

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED FISCAL YEAR 1986 APPROPRIATIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, funds appropriated or otherwise made available to or for the use of the Department of Defense by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1986, (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190), and which were not otherwise authorized by law, are authorized to be obligated and expended as provided in such Act.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AND LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

MARINER FUND.—Of the funds appropriated or made available by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1986, none shall be available for construction of commercial type vessels, with or without military specifications, for lease to private shipping concerns under the Mariner Fund or any other program.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR OBLIGATION OF CERTAIN UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.

Of the funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190, but which may not be obligated or expended for the purposes for which appropriated by virtue of section 2 of this chapter, and of the funds made available for obligation and expenditure form prior year unobligated balances by section 8103 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1986, the following amounts are authorized to be obligated and expended for the stated purposes:

(1) for military pay, $1,599,400,000;

(2) for military retirement accrual payments, $2,156,000,000;

(3) for Coastal Defense Augmentation, $140,000,000;

(4) for the Expendable Launch Vehicle Program, $1,498,686,000; and

(5) Any amounts remaining available from such funds shall be available for readiness and for other purposes, including funds authorized for obligation and expenditure for purposes listed in clauses (1), (2), (3), and (4) not otherwise required for such purposes.

SEC. 4. REVISION OR REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 99-190.

(a) AIR DEFENSE AIRCRAFT COMPETITION.—The paragraph under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force" in title III of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190), is amended by striking out "of which $200,000,000 shall be available only to initiate the air defense aircraft competition authorized by law" in the matter preceding the first proviso; and

REVISION OF CONTRACTING OUT PROVISION.—Section 8089 of such Act is amended by striking out "ten" and inserting in lieu thereof "40".

SEC. 5. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATION ON THE P-3 AIRCRAFT.

Funds made available for the procurement of P-3 aircraft for the Navy for fiscal year 1986 may be used for procurement of such aircraft for the active or reserve forces of the Navy, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 6. TEMPORARY WAIVER ON POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION LIMITATIONS.

In computing the number of counterintelligence polygraph examinations that may be conducted during fiscal year 1986 under section 1221 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 726), there may be excluded from such computation any polygraph examination conducted during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 1986, if such examination—

(1) is conducted by the Air Force under an authorization granted by the Secretary of Defense on November 24, 1981; or

(2) is conducted under an authorization granted by the Secretary of Defense on August 31, 1982, and is conducted on a person who is participating in a national program—

(A) which has as its purpose the collection of specialized intelligence through reconnaissance;

(B) which is under the purview of the Director of Central Intelligence; and

(C) for which a polygraph examination was established on or before October 1, 1985, as a condition for participation in such program.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

CHAPTER III A

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN UNAUTHORIZED FISCAL YEAR 1986 APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding section 8109 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-190) and except as otherwise provided in this chapter, funds appropriated or otherwise made available to or for the use of the Department of Defense by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190), and which were not otherwise authorized by law, are authorized to be obligated and expended as provided in such Act.

SEC. 2. UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

The following programs and amounts provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-190) are not authorized to be obligated or expended:

Research and Development: Air Force Space Defense System, $15,066,000.

AIR Force MEECN communications upgrade, $15,000,000.

Operation and Maintenance: Audit/inventory report reductions not taken in the appropriations act, $29,000,000.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION AND LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.

MARINER FUND.—Of the funds appropriated or made available by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, none shall be available for construction of commercial type vessels, with or without military specifications, for lease to private shipping concerns under the Mariner Fund or any other program.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION FOR OBLIGATION OF CERTAIN UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.

Of the funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190), but which may not be obligated or expended for the purposes for which appropriated by virtue of section 3 of this chapter, and of the funds made available for obligation and expenditure from prior year unobligated balances by section 8103 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, the following amounts are authorized to be obligated and expended for the stated purposes and are subject to the same notification procedures set forth in section 8103 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, except for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services:

(1) for military pay, $1,599,400,000;

(2) for military retirement accrual payments, $2,156,000,000;

(3) for Coastal Defense Augmentation, $140,000,000;

(4) for Department of Defense Space Recovery Program, $1,498,686,000;

(5) for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services, $260,000,000; and

(6) Any amounts remaining available from such funds are authorized to be obligated and expended and are available for readiness and for other purposes, including funds authorized for obligation and expenditure for purposes listed in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) not otherwise required for such purposes.

SEC. 5. REVISION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 99-190.

(a) AIR DEFENSE AIRCRAFT COMPETITION.—The paragraph under the heading "Aircraft Procurement, Air Force" in title III of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190), is amended by striking out ", of which $200,000,000 shall be available only to initiate the air defense aircraft competition authorized by law" in the matter preceding the first proviso;

(b) REVISION OF DRUG INTERDICTION FUNDS.—Of funds made available in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, Public Law 99-190, $35,000,000 made available for purchase of one AC-130H aircraft and $3,000,000 made available for P-3 aircraft modifications shall be available only for the following purposes:

(1) for HC-130 tanker, $18,500,000;

(2) for Aerostat radar, $12,000,000; and

(3) for APS-138 radar system, $7,500,000;

(c) 120MM MORTAR.—Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, for procurement of the 120mm mortar, obligations and expenditures may be incurred only in accordance with the requirements set forth in House Report 99-235 and Section 8095 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 99-190); and

(d) M72E4 LIGHTWEIGHT MULTIPURPOSE WEAPON.—From the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986, the Army shall complete development and operational testing of the M72E4, type classify the weapon, and acquire a technical data package.

SEC. 6. TEMPORARY WAIVER ON POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION LIMITATIONS.

In computing the number of counterintelligence polygraph examinations that may be conducted during fiscal year 1986 under section 1221 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99-145; 99 Stat. 726), there may be excluded from such computation any polygraph examination conducted during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on September 30, 1986, if such examination—

(1) is conducted by the Air Force under an authorization granted by the Secretary of Defense on November 24, 1981; or

(2) is conducted under an authorization granted by the Secretary of Defense on August 31, 1982, and is conducted on a person who is participating in a national program—

(A) which has as its purpose the collection of specialized intelligence through reconnaissance;

(B) which is under the purview of the Director of Central Intelligence; and

(C) for which a polygraph examination was established on or before October 1, 1985, as a condition for participation in such program.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 84 which has been reported in technical disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, for close to a year now, Members concerned with the unchecked decline in American shipyards and the mounting loss of shipyard jobs have been working hard to put in place a program to arrest that decline and save those jobs.

I am proud to have played a role in urging timely, positive consideration of legislation in the House this year to authorize the Mariner Build and Charter Program. The Mariner Program, like its predecessor in the 1950's, would add militarily useful ships to the U.S.-Flag merchant fleet, and provide lifesaving work for a number of troubled domestic shipyards that are on the verge of closing their gates. A sum of $852 million had been set aside in late December's fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution for the Mariner Program, but made contingent on the subsequent enactment of authorizing legislation. Authorizing legislation has been making steady progress in the House. Both the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Armed Services and the full Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees have approved versions of Mariner authorizing legislation in the last 2 months.

Unfortunately, in the early hours of Friday, June 6, the other body agreed without objection to an amendment prohibiting fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution funds from being spent on the Mariner Program. The other body took the additional action of reobligating the previously earmarked Mariner funds into several nonshipbuilding related Defense Department accounts. That amendment, has been generally incorporated into the conference report before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to debate whether one defense program, such as the expendable Launch Vehicle Program, represents a more urgent and higher priority for defense dollars than a program like the Mariner Build and Charter Program. However, I do want to make the point that the $852 million that had been set aside in the fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution for the Mariner fund had come about as a result of prior year Navy shipbuilding program savings. In the next year or two, or three, our national decisionmakers will finally realize that too many U.S. shipyards have closed, and the U.S.-flag merchant fleet has all but disappeared, and our national security has been placed in jeopardy because of the decline in those critical, related industries. When that moment comes, a program like Mariner Build and Charter will be seen as an effective means of adding militarily useful ships to the U.S.-flag merchant fleet, and maintaining a level of work in the remaining domestic shipyard base. It is unlikely that a funding source like this year's pool of prior year Navy shipbuilding program savings will be found next year, or the year after, especially in the face of Gramm-Rudman. America's shipyards are now facing a crisis situation. This is not a national problem looming down the road. It is upon us now. In the last 3 years, four major shipyards, deemed by the Navy to be key components of the U.S. defense mobilization base, have gone out of business and locked their gates. A century-old tradition of shipbuilding at the Fore River Shipyard in Quincy, MA, is at risk. There is not more work in the yard, and the owner is seeking to dispose of the facility. Several other major U.S. yards are rapidly running out of work. The Mariner program makes sense this year. It must proceed ahead.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 12, strike out lines 4 to 7, and insert:

Using available funds authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, the Secretary of the Army shall, in consultation with State officials of the Great Lakes region, develop emergency contingency plans to prevent or control near term flooding along the

Great Lakes. The Secretary shall report to Congress within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act on the contingency plans. The Secretary is authorized to spend up to $1,000,000 for the purposes of this provision.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For an additional amount, for "Flood Control and Coastal Emergencies", as authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Using available funds authorized by section 5 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941, as amended, the Secretary of the Army shall, in consultation with State officials of the Great Lakes region, develop emergency contingency plans to prevent or control near term flooding along the Great Lakes. The Secretary shall report to Congress within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act on the contingency plans. The Secretary is authorized to spend up to $1,000,000 for the purposes of this provision.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 13, strike out all after line 13 over to and including line 2 on page 14.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Of the funds previously appropriated or made available for research, development, test and evaluation for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986 pursuant to Public Law 99-190, $55,600,000 shall be available only for grants or contributions to educational institutions for research activities, construction of research related facilities and for other related purposes as provided in House Report 99-450 accompanying House Joint Resolution 465, Public Law 99-190, and the Secretary of Defense shall provide these grants or contributions expeditiously: *Provided*, That such grants or contributions are a one time obligation and expenditure and shall not interfere with or change the existing system of other competitive research grants or contracts.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my distinguished colleagues in supporting the conference committee's amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986. The Senate version of this bill, which delegated funding for a number of university research facilities, was obviously flawed. I am pleased to see that the conference committee saw fit to add these projects back into the bill.

I have many problems with the argument that proposals for university research facilities should be subject to a merit review process. The foremost among them is the geographic discrimination that is likely to result if merit review is applied to facilities funding in the same way that it is applied to research grants. In the distribution of Federal research support, there is a distinct pattern of historical preference for schools in the East, and to a lesser extent, the far West. The geographic distribution of Department of Defense funds to colleges and universities in fiscal year 1984 is painfully illustrative of this fact. Just seven schools in the eastern United States received 54 percent of the year's research money. The West was a distant second, with 7 schools awarded 11 percent of the funds. Perhaps even more startling is the fact that 2 schools in the East accounted for 49 percent—nearly half—of the total DOD funds for university research that year.

The National Science Foundation's peer review system also helps perpetuate this inequitable distribution of research funds. Not only did the top twenty recipients receive 42 percent of all funds in fiscal year 1984, but not a single one of those 20 schools is located in the South and Southwest. Institutions in only 11 States were privileged enough to rank among the top 20.

The trend toward concentration of our Nation's research funds in the hands of just a few institutions must stop. The bill before us, in the long run, will help to redress the current imbalance by providing these universities with the means to compete effectively for research funds and to contribute more greatly to our Nation's scientific progress. I urge my colleagues to support this conference committee's amendment.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the university project funding included in the Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report, and urge my colleagues to join me in opposing efforts to remove them.

There has been discussion about the peer review process and the appropriateness of congressional involvement in the funding of university projects. I would like to clarify the issues and lay to rest the misinformation clouding this debate.

The peer review process was established to ensure that Federal funding was directed toward scientifically responsible projects. It was designed to provide the scientific community a role in determining where research funds were applied, but it was never intended to substitute for or reduce Congress ultimate responsibility for defining and assigning fiscal priorities.

Several weeks ago, arguing that Congress had established peer review as the sole means of allocating university research funds, a member of the other body cited provision of the Competition in Contracting Act as a justification for eliminating this research facility funding. As one of the principle authors of CICA, I too believe that the philosophy of competition is relevant to the debate. I disagree entirely, however, with the conclusions which were drawn from the debate.

The Competition in Contracting Act was written to ensure the Federal Government gets a fair value for its dollar. The provisions regarding peer review were not written to establish peer review as the sole means of distributing research dollars. In fact, the peer review provisions were added, in consultation with the university community, to ensure that CICA did not eliminate peer review as a legitimate procurement tool. This misconception aside, there is a broader policy question for consideration.

The money we are discussing today is not for research. It is for the construction of research facilities. It is an investment in the research infrastructure of this Nation which is both necessary and desirable. It is an investment which will raise the research and development capabilities of the Nation and establish new opportunities for scientific achievement.

As some of my colleagues in the other body have indicated, competition is at the very heart of the question we are considering today. The Federal Government funds about $8.5 billion in university research. According to the National Science Foundation, over 55 percent of this money goes to only 20 universities. The other 45 percent is distributed among the remaining 570 colleges and universities. The investment we make today will enable these universities to enter this elite arena and aggressively compete for research dollars. This is the competition which lies at the very heart of the Competition in Contracting Act.

A few Members of the other body have questioned the scientific merit of these projects. Although I cannot speak for all 10 of the projects, I can speak directly to the merits of the Microelectronic Engineering Center at the Rochester Institute of Technology.

In 1980, RIT, assisted by Texas Instruments, conducted an analysis of the nationwide demand for microelectronic engineers. This study demonstrated a current shortfall of over 2,000 engineers, and projected that this shortfall would increase by more than 400 per year. Studies conducted by the Office of Technology Assessment and the Business-

Higher Education forum caution that this shortfall poses a major threat to America's competitive position in worldwide trade.

In 1982, RIT initiated the Nation's first program to meet the growing need for microelectronic engineers. Working closely with Texas Instruments, IBM, Motorola, National Semiconductor, and Eastman Kodak, RIT designed a program specially suited to meet the needs of the American microelectronic industry. It is anticipated that this program will meet a full 20 percent of the forecasted need for microelectronic engineers.

I would like to lay to rest what is perhaps the greatest misconception. the money we discuss today is not new money. These projects were funded by Congress in the 1986 continuing resolution. In fact, the language we discuss today is the language which the Department of Defense argued was necessary to allow the release of the funds. This is not money being drawn from other research accounts. This is not money that would have otherwise been committed to research and training. This is funding that this Congress already appropriated for the construction of research facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the Rochester Institute of Technology Center for Microelectronic Engineering will not by itself solve the competitive problems we face with the Japanese in the field of microelectronic engineering. But it will provide the support necessary to allow American businesses to compete on a level playing field. I urge my colleagues to support the supplemental conference report and oppose efforts to delete these university projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: Page 14, strike out lines 7 to 13, and insert:

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR NORTHERN IRELAND AND IRELAND

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in titles I, II, III, and IV in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190), not more than $20,000,000 of any of such funds may be made available for the United States contribution to the International Fund established pursuant to the November 15, 1985, agreement between the United Kingdom and Ireland: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in such Act may be contributed to the International Fund until the enactment of legislation specifically authorizing assistance for such purpose.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and concur therein. In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR NORTHERN IRELAND AND IRELAND

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "Economic Support Fund", not less than $50,000,000, which shall be available only for the United States contribution to the International Fund established pursuant to the November 15, 1985, agreement between the United Kingdom and Ireland, to be derived from funds appropriated or otherwise made available by the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190), as follows: $4,900,000 by transfer from title I of such Act, $12,350,000 of funds made available by such Act for the "Economic Support Fund", $9,100,000 by transfer from title II of such Act, excluding funds made available for the "Economic Support Fund", $20,000,000 by transfer from title III of such Act, and $3,650,000 by transfer from title IV of such Act.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the money of aid for Ireland where the administration had originally requested $20 million. It is my understanding that under this particular provision we are going with a $50 million figure, and could the gentleman tell me what the figure was that the other body brought into the conference?

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the figure was $20 million. The compromise provided that the $50 million be taken from several accounts in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I am a little confused as to how we got a compromise here.

We came in at $50 million, the other body came in at $20 million, and we compromised at $50 million.

Mr. CONTE. I think the big compromise came where we agreed that the money would come proportionally from different accounts in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. WALKER. Well, we are taking this $50 million, as I understand it, out of multilateral assistance, we are taking it out of bilateral assistance, we are taking it out of military assistance and out of the Eximbank.

So we literally now are in a position where we are cutting the biggest amount, as I see it, from the military assistance in order to send the money to Ireland. Is that my understanding of it?

Mr. CONTE. These amounts are based on the proportion of the total 1986 act represented by each of those accounts, and we felt that this was a very fair compromise and worked it out with our Senate counterparts, Senator KASTEN and others.

Mr. WALKER. The biggest single amount that goes into this $50 million that was the compromise figure, the high figure comes out of the military assistance program. Is that correct?

Mr. CONTE. I think $20 million, yes.

Mr. WALKER. So the gentleman does in fact deplete other military assistance programs in order to provide this money for the Irish aid which was a figure above the administration's request and above the Senate-passed figure. Is that correct?

Mr. CONTE. Well, as I recall correctly, the authorization amount is $50 million, and the administration in the letter sent to me does not raise an objection to this $50 million.

Mr. WALKER. But it is a figure which exceeds their original request by $30 million?

Mr. CONTE. At this time I would have to say "yes," but we felt that the situation there was so grave that we had to move forward expeditiously, and the administration at this point would not object to this figure providing we took it from these accounts proportionately, which we did.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support our chairman's motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment in regard to aid to Ireland and Northern Ireland.

All that this motion does is to bring the Ireland aid provision back to the original House position of furnishing $50 million in assistance in fiscal year 1986 rather than only $20 million as provided by the Senate. The amendment to the Senate amendment which is included in the chairman's motion merely specifies in a more detailed way the previously appropriated accounts from which this aid will be taken.

The House bill required a transfer of the entire $50 million from the economic support fund. That fund advances U.S. economic, political and security interests by offering flexible grant or loan economic assistance to friendly countries of strategic concern to the United States. The administration strongly opposed taking the entire $50 million from that account.

The Senate bill allowed the funds to be transferred from any or all of the four titles in the fiscal year 1986 Foreign Aid Appropriations Act. Our subcommittee chairman objected to that because of his concern that the administration might take it all from one or two accounts which he supports.

A compromise was reached, just as it is supposed to be in a House-Senate conference, whereby we set out in bill language exactly how much is to come from each foreign aid account. Those amounts are based on the proportion of the total 1986 act represented by each of those accounts. That is a fair compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not have to tell you how important this aid to Ireland is at this time of promise of change and development in Northern

reland. It is not always pretty, but eople are beginning to talk to each ther over there. We earnestly hope nd pray that this is an opportune me to offer material and political upport through this appropriation.

All of us are blessed with varying umbers of Irish-American constituents. They don't give a hoot about the etails of which accounts are tapped or this money, but they strongly support this aid. They don't want this nessed up at this late date.

Let's adopt the chairman's motion nd get on with this timely aid to Ireand.

□ 1800

Mr. WALKER. Does anyone have some idea as we take the money, $20 million out of military assistance, $12 million out of economic support, where this money is coming out of? Is this money coming out of, for instance, food to Ethiopia in the Economic Support Fund? Is it money that comes out of providing military assistance to help, for instance, the Afghan freedom fighters? I mean, where is the money coming from?

Mr. CONTE. That money for Afghanistan is earmarked money and, therefore, it will not come out of that. As for the balance of the $20 million out of military assistance is unallocated at this point.

Mr. WALKER. Will it come out of, for instance, Israel?

Mr. CONTE. No.

Mr. WALKER. Much of the military assistance goes to Israel. Would the money come out of the Israeli fund?

Mr. CONTE. No, it will not come out of the Israeli fund, because that is earmarked money.

Mr. WALKER. I see. Who is not going to get money as a result of the $20 million we are allocating under this program?

Mr. CONTE. We do not know at this point. It is the entire MAP program.

Mr. WALKER. In other words, there will be places. It could be the Philippines?

Mr. CONTE. I doubt that, because that is earmarked money.

Mr. WALKER. Korea?

Mr. CONTE. Any place where the money is earmarked, you cannot use it for this purpose.

Mr. WALKER. Korea?

Mr. CONTE. I do not think Korea gets MAP money. I am quite sure Korea does not.

Mr. WALKER. My point is simply that we took the highest possible figure here and we ended up taking it out of somebody. Now, as I go down through all of this, it is coming out of no one, evidently, and yet it has to come out of somewhere. Someone else is going to suffer in order for us to come out with the highest possible figure. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Mr. CONTE. It is a reasonable assumption. We are giving the President the discretionary authority to determine which funds will be used for this purpose as long as the funds are not earmarked.

Mr. WALKER. But we have taken away his discretion by raising the funding $30 million above what was originally requested.

Mr. CONTE. We have given him the discretion to take a little more money out.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I am not really very happy with a compromise that ends up compromising at the highest possible figure. I mean, that is essentially what we did. We came out with a compromise that was the highest possible figure, which is one of my objections to what we often find in supplemental appropriation bills.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his understanding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 14, lines 15 and 16, strike out "for the "Economic Support Fund" in Public Law 99-190" and insert "in title II of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190)".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "in title II of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1986 (as enacted in Public Law 99-190), subject to the notification process of the Committees on Appropriations".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 14, line 18, strike out "shall" and insert "may".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the house recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", or the equivalent amount in local currencies, may".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 97: Page 15, after line 7, insert:

Notwithstanding any limitations on assistance to Haiti contained in Public Law 98-473 or Public Law 99-83, funds previously appropriated for the purposes of chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be made available for Haiti to carry out such purposes: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be made available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

Notwithstanding any limitations on assistance to Haiti contained in Public Law 98-473 or Public Law 99-83, funds in the amount of $750,000 previously appropriated for the purposes of chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be made available for Haiti to carry out such purposes: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available pursuant to this paragraph may be made available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance: *Provided further*, That the funds provided under this paragraph shall be made available only to provide nonlethal military assistance for Haiti.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 98: Page 15, after line 7, insert:

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PHILIPPINES

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for the "Economic Support Fund", $100,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be made available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount of "Military Assistance", $50,000,000: *Provided*, That in addition, $29,355,000 previously obligated for direct loans to the Philippines under the heading "Foreign Military Credit Sales" in Public Law 98-473 and Public Law 99-190, shall be deobligated and transferred to this appropriation, to be made available for obligation until September 30, 1986: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be made available only for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be made available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PHILIPPINES

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for the "Economic Support Fund", $100,000,000, to remain available until March 31, 1987: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Military Assistance", $50,000,000 to remain available until March 31, 1987: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only for the Philippines: *Provided further*, That none of these funds may be available for obligation unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified fifteen days in advance.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 101: Page 15, after line 10, insert:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts of budget authority that become available during fiscal year 1986 as a result of the forgiving, pursuant to section 4(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, of any loan made pursuant to section 4(a) of such Act, not less than $3,000,000,000 of budget authority (and such amounts of contract authority as correspond to the amounts of budget authority) is rescinded.

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING PROGRAMS

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s), is further reduced in fiscal year 1986 by not more than $41,390,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1), is further reduced in fiscal year 1986 by not more than $10,128,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the amounts of budget authority that become available during fiscal year 1986 as a result of the forgiving, pursuant to section 4(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, of any loan made pursuant to section 4(a) of such Act, not less than $5,250,000,000 of budget authority (and such amounts of contract authority as correspond to the amounts of budget authority) are rescinded.

Of the amounts of budget authority that become available during fiscal year 1987 as a result of the forgiving, pursuant to section 4(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, of any loan made pursuant to section 4(a) of such Act $6,042,000,000 of budget authority (and such amounts of contract authority as correspond to the amounts of budget authority) are rescinded on or after October 1, 1986 and before September 30, 1987.

RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s), is reduced in fiscal year 1986 by not more than $41,390,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

The limitation otherwise applicable to the maximum payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 236 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1), is further reduced in fiscal year 1986 by not more than $10,128,000 in uncommitted balances of authorizations provided for this purpose in appropriations Acts.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 107: Page 16, after line 23, insert:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Of the funds appropriated in section 119 of Public Law 99-190 for necessary expenses to carry out title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, an additional $600,000,000 is hereby made available: *Provided*, That the allocation of the $600,000,000 made available by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the formula in effect on October 1, 1984.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Of the funds appropriated in section 119 of Public Law 99-190 for necessary expenses to carry out title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, an additional

$1,200,000,000 is hereby made available: *Provided,* That the allocation of the $1,200,000,000 made available by this paragraph shall be in accordance with the formula in effect on October 1, 1984.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 108: Page 17, after line 11, insert:

SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Space flight, control and data communications", $526,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

SPACE FLIGHT, CONTROL AND DATA COMMUNICATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Space flight, control and data communications", $431,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1987: *Provided,* That, upon enactment into law of this Act, $5,000,000 shall be transferred to "Research and development": *Provided further,* That $100,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988, is appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for "Space flight, control and data communications", and shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1986: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated for fiscal year 1987 in the previous proviso may not be obligated until the Administrator of NASA has certified that the recommendations of the Rogers Commission have been implemented or are being implemented, or that an alternative approach satisfies the direction of the recommendation.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand the language on amendment number 108 basically requires a second sourcing of the solid rocket booster program?

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I understand that we included report language.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the conferees direct NASA to make available sufficient funds to study an alternative solid rocket booster program.

Mr. CONTE. That is the report language, yes.

Mr. WALKER. That is not a requirement that has been placed upon NASA at this point to go to a second sourcing?

Mr. CONTE. That is strong advice, I would say.

Mr. WALKER. The reason why I raise the question is the authorization is in the process of going through full-fledged hearings at the present time looking at a whole variety of things. I am wondering why the Appropriations Committee felt a need to wade in and make this rather substantive determination before the authorization committee has completed its hearings.

We just had a problem here a few minutes ago talking about the agriculture program. Here is another place where the Appropriations Committee has evidently just usurped the ability of the authorization committee to complete its work. I am wondering if we cannot at least wait until the authorization committee can do some of its work.

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

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I can understand the gentleman's concern. The gentleman is one of the important members on the Committee on Science and Technology, and I know of the gentleman's interest in the space program.

What we were doing here is trying to support one of the recommendations of the Presidential Commission that was investigating the accident of the *Challenger.* One of the recommendations there, of course, was to look closely at the solid rocket booster and, because there has been a sole source on the solid rocket booster in the past, there was an indication clearly on the part of the Commission and also on the part of those who have been funding NASA, that there ought to be a closer look at another source.

So the language does direct NASA to study an alternative solid rocket booster design such as, and I think the gentleman quoted it, "a unitary case, single-cast propellant," et cetera. That does not bar any other particular designs from being considered beyond the unitary case or the single-cast propellant.

So that is the reason why this was inserted in amendment 108. We think it is a good amendment, and it is one I believe that is in keeping with the recommendations of the Presidential Commission.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, I certainly agree with the gentleman that it is one of the recommendations of the Rogers Commission and one that should be looked at very, very closely, because we all know at this point that the solid rocket boosters were a major contributing factor in the accident.

My question is why we picked out this one area, decided to move ahead with that in the appropriations bill before the authorization committee has completed its work. It seems to me that what we want to do in order to recover from the accident and make certain that we have a responsible program is make certain that all the Rogers Commission recommendations get implemented, that they get implemented in a way which makes sense, which has a policy framework that is agreed upon by both authorization and appropriating committees, and that we do a disservice to that process by beginning to pick and choose among these things and including them in an appropriations bill.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, and perhaps better than most people in the committee or on the floor now, this, of course, was one of the major recommendations by the Presidential Commission. There were some nine recommendations that were made, and I am sure that most of them will be implemented before we return to using the shuttle to lift satellites into orbit. That is the only reason for our putting the language into the bill.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is correct.

I simply further make the point that those are also questions that have authorization implications as well as appropriations implications, and that by making policy decisions of that type in the appropriations bill, I think that we do a disservice to the process that will ultimately produce a broadly based policy.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe this language gives this particular problem greater urgency. Probably every expert that has looked at this problem over the past few months would suggest that the real problem, the most serious problem, was with the solid rocket booster. So that is one of the reasons why we inserted this language.

Mr. WALKER. Let me say to the gentleman that it is my view, after listening to some of the hearings, that

71-059 O-87-17 (Pt. 11)

technical failure might have been in the solid rocket booster program, but we are also finding the more serious failure may have been in the quality assurance program and some of those things within NASA.

□ 1810

That kind of coordinated policy that assures an upgrade of the quality assurance programs, that assures an upgrade of the safety programs, that assures better management, and so on, is as important as the technical fix that may be involved in the Solid Rocket Booster Program or in a second sourcing of the solid rocket boosters.

That is my concern, that this is being done out of phase, with some of the rest of the things that may very well be a very, very important part of a recovery program.

That is my concern, as I read that language. It seems to me to in some way put the cart before the horse.

I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding so that I could further question the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I know the Space Shuttle *Challenger* Accident Commission recommended that no options be prematurely precluded in this area, and I am assuming that the gentleman's intent that the list of alternatives to be studied be longer than the two specific options cited in the statement of the managers' report.

Mr. WALKER. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct. We are directing NASA to get a look at more than just the two specific areas that we targeted in the supplemental. We use the word "et cetera," which, of course, would include more than the unitary case or the single cast propellant.

In further response to the gentleman, I am sure the gentleman has read the report rather thoroughly, but on page 45, in the second paragraph from the end of that page, it says:

> The conferees have also agreed to provide $100 million of the $531 million recommended as an appropriation for fiscal year 1987. These funds may not be used until the administrator of NASA has certified that the recommendations of the Rogers Commission have been implemented or are being implemented, or that an alternative approach satisfies the objective of the recommendation.

I would think the gentleman would agree with that particular language.

Mr. WALKER. I certainly do agree with that. My problem is not with that particular language. Obviously, the President's Executive order would allow the administrator of NASA to certify that the recommendations are being implemented. The Executive order says that much.

My concern is that by highlighting certain things in this report, we may in fact get some of the things that need to be done out of sync, and the worst possible thing at the present time is to have the kind of recovery where all kinds of people are issuing orders and no one knows precisely what it is that is getting done and how it is getting done.

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure that after the administrator of NASA gets a look at this record and gets a clear indication of the other areas with respect to the Commission that have been highlighted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania—attention will be paid to it.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 109: Page 18, line 3, after "care"," insert "up to".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "not less than $25,000,000 nor more than".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 111: Page 18, strike out lines 13 to 18, and insert:

For payments to defray the costs of training and provision of incentives to employers to hire and train certain veterans, as authorized to be appropriated by section 16 of the Veterans' Job Training Act (appearing at 29 U.S.C. 1721 and as amended by section 201(d) of Public Law 99-238), $35,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction, minor projects".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For payments to defray the costs of training and provision of incentives to employers to hire and train certain veterans as authorized by the Veterans' Job Training Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 1721), $35,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988, and to be derived by transfer from "Construction, minor projects".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 112. Page 18, after line 18, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Retroactive to October 1, 1985, all payments for services performed on a contractual basis in conjunction with loan guaranty operations shall be charged to the VA loan guaranty revolving fund.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Retroactive to October 1, 1985, all payments for appraisals performed on a contractual basis in connection with the liquidation of housing loans guaranteed, insured, or made in conjunction with loan guarantee operations shall be charged to the VA loan guaranty revolving fund.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 18, after line 18, insert:

Each provision of law amended by Public Law 99-289, is amended by striking out "June 6, 1986" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 25, 1986".

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS IMPROVEMENTS

(a) PROJECT QUALITY CRITERIA.—Section 119(d)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) by inserting a dash before "(A)";

(2) by indenting subparagraphs (A) and (B) in the same manner as subparagraphs (C) and (D), as inserted by this subsection;

(3) in subparagraph (A), by striking out "as the primary criterion,";

(4) by striking out "and" and the end of subparagraph (B); and

(5) by striking out subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) the following other criteria:

"(i) the extent to which the grant will stimulate economic recovery by leveraging private investment;

"(ii) the number of permanent jobs to be created and their relation to the amount of grant funds requested;

"(iii) the proportion of permanent jobs accessible to lower income persons and minorities, including persons who are unemployed;

"(iv) the extent to which the project will retain jobs that will be lost without the provision of a grant under this section;

"(v) the extent to which the project will relieve the most pressing employment or residential needs of the applicant by—

"(I) reemploying workers in a skill that has recently suffered a sharp increase in unemployment locally:

"(II) retraining recently unemployed residents in new skills;

"(III) providing training to increase the local pool of skilled labor; or

"(IV) producing decent housing for low- and moderate-income persons in cases where such housing is in severe shortage in the area of the applicant, except that an application shall be considered to produce housing for low- and moderate-income persons under this clause only if such application proposes that (a) not less than 51 percent of all funds available for the project shall be used for dwelling units and related facilities; and (b) not less than 30 percent of all funds used for dwelling units and related facilities shall be used for dwelling units to be occupied by persons of low and moderate income, or not less than 20 percent of all dwelling units made available to occupancy using such funds shall be occupied by persons of low and moderate income, whichever results in the occupancy of more dwelling units by persons of low and moderate income;

"(vi) the impact of the proposed activities on the fiscal base of the city or urban county and its relation to the amount of grant funds requested;

"(vii) the extent to which State or local Government funding or special economic incentives have been committed; and

"(viii) the extent to which the project will have a substantial impact on physical and economic development of the city or urban county, the proposed activities are likely to be accomplished in a timely fashion with the grant amount available, and the city or urban county has demonstrated performance in housing and community development programs; and

"(D) additional consideration for projects with the following characteristics:

"(i) projects to be located within a city or urban county which did not receive a preliminary grant approval under this section during the 12-month period preceding the date on which applications are required to be submitted for the grant competition involved; and

"(ii) twice the amount of the additional consideration provided under clause (i) for projects to be located in cities or urban counties which did not receive a preliminary grant approval during the 24-month period preceding the date on which applications under this section are required to be submitted for the grant competition involved.

If a city or urban county has submitted and has pending more than one application, the additional consideration provided by subparagraph (D) of the preceding sentence shall be available only to the project in such city or urban county which received the highest number of points under subparagraph (C) of such sentence.".

(d) SELECTION LIMITATIONS AND CRITERIA WEIGHT.—Section 119(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The Secretary shall award points to each application as follows:

"(A) not more than 35 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

"(B) not more than 35 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(B);

"(C) not more than 33 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(C); and

"(D)(i) 1 additional point on the basis of the criterion referred to in paragraph (1)(D)(i); or

"(ii) 2 additional points on the basis of the criterion referred to in paragraph (1)(D)(ii).

"(4) The Secretary shall distribute grant funds under this section so that to the extent practicable during each funding cycle—

"(A) 65 percent of the funds is first made available utilizing all of the criteria set forth in paragraph (1); and

"(B) 35 percent of the funds is then made available solely on the basis of the factors referred to in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1).

"(5)(A) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall hold—

"(i) 3 competitions for grants under paragraph (1) for cities not described in the first sentence of subsection (i) (relating to small cities) and urban counties; and

"(ii) 3 competitions for cities described in the first sentence of subsection (i) (relating to small cities).

"(B) Each competition for grants described in any clause of subparagraph (A) shall be for an amount equal to the sum of—

"(i) approximately ⅓ of the funds available for such grants for the fiscal year;

"(ii) any funds available for such grants in any previous competition that are not awarded; and

"(iii) any funds available for such grants in any previous competition that are recaptured.".

(c) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, for purposes of funding decisions made before October 15, 1986, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall give additional consideration, equal to the points otherwise awarded under section 119(d)(1)(C) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended by this section, in the case of a project to be located in a city or urban county to which no grant under section 119 of such Act was made and not terminated since October 15, 1984, if such project has met the criteria for preliminary approval in 3 consecutive funding cycles including the current cycle. If a city or urban county has submitted and has pending more than one application, the additional consideration provided by the preceding sentence shall be available only to the project in such city or urban county which received the largest number of points under section 119(d)(1)(C) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(d) USE OF REPAID GRANT FUNDS.—Section 119(f) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In any case in which the project proposes the repayment to the applicant of the grant funds, such funds shall be made available by the applicant for economic development activities that are eligible activities under this section or section 104. The applicant shall annually provide the Secretary with a statement of the projected receipt and use of repaid grant funds during the next year together with a report acceptable to the Secretary of the use of such funds during the most recent proceeding full fiscal year of the applicant.".

(e) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Section 119(r) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

"(r) In utilizing the discretion of the Secretary when providing assistance and applying selection criteria under this section, the Secretary may not discriminate against applications on the basis of (1) the type of activity involved, whether such activity is primarily housing, industrial, or commercial; or (2) the type of applicant, whether such applicant is a city or urban county.".

(f) REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1)(A) Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period following the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report evaluating the eligibility standards and selection criteria applicable under section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(B) Such report shall evaluate in detail the standards and criteria specified in such section that measure the level or comparative degree of economic distress of cities and urban counties and the effect of the grants awarded on the basis of such standards and criteria on stimulating the maximum economic development activity.

(C) Such report shall also evaluate in detail the extent to which the economic and social data utilized by the Secretary in awarding grants under such section is current and accurate, and shall compare the data used by the Secretary with other available data. The Comptroller General shall make recommendations to the Congress on whether or not other data should be collected by the Federal Government in order to fairly and accurately distribute grants under such section based on the level or comparative degree of economic distress. The Comptroller General shall also make recommendations on whether or not exist-

ing data should be collected more frequently in order to ensure that timely data is used to evaluate grant applications under such section.

(2) Not later than the expiration of the 3-month period following the date of the final competition for grants for fiscal year 1986 under section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing the effect of the amendments made by this section on—

(A) the targeting of grant funds to cities and urban counties having the highest level or degree of economic distress;

(B) the distribution of grants funds among regions of the United States;

(C) the number and types of projects receiving grants;

(d) the per capita funding levels for each city, urban county, or identifiable community described in subsection (p) of such section 119, receiving assistance under such section 119; and

(E) the stimulation of the maximum economic development activity

(g) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section. Such regulations shall be published for comment in the Federal Register not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The provisions of subsection (d), and of section 119(d)(1)(D), section 119(d)(3), and section 119(d)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(h) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to the making of urban development action grants that have not received the preliminary approval of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development before the date on which final regulations issued by the Secretary under subsection (h) become effective. For the fiscal year in which the amendments made by this section become applicable, such amendments shall only apply with respect to the aggregate amount awarded for such grants on or after such effective date.

(i) FISCAL YEAR 1986 COMPETITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall hold—

(1) 2 competitions for grants under section 119(d)(1) for cities not described in the first sentence of subsection (i) of such section and urban counties; and

(2) 1 competition for such grants for cities described in the first sentence of subsection (i) of such section,

between April 15, 1986, and October 1, 1986.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114 and concur there in with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: Each provision of law amended by Public Law 99-289, is amended by striking out "June 6, 1986" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 25, 1986".

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS IMPROVEMENTS

(a) PROJECT QUALITY CRITERIA.—Section 119(d)(1) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended—

(1) by inserting a dash before "(A)";

(2) by indenting subparagraphs (A) and (B) in the same manner as subparagraphs (C) and (D), as inserted by this subsection;

(3) in subparagraph (A), by striking out "as the primary criterion,";

(4) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(5) by striking out subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(C) the following other criteria:

"(i) the extent to which the grant will stimulate economic recovery by leveraging private investment;

"(ii) the number of permanent jobs to be created and their relation to the amount of grant funds requested;

"(iii) the proportion of permanent jobs accessible to lower income persons and minorities, including persons who are unemployed;

"(iv) the extent to which the project will retain jobs that will be lost without the provision of a grant under this section;

"(v) the extent to which the project will relieve the most pressing employment or residential needs of the applicant by—

"(I) reemploying workers in a skill that has recently suffered a sharp increase in unemployment locally;

"(II) retraining recently unemployed residents in new skills;

"(III) providing training to increase the local pool of skilled labor; or

"(IV) producing decent housing for low- and moderate-income persons in cases where such housing is in severe shortage in the area of the applicant, except that an application shall be considered to produce housing for low- and moderate-income persons under this clause only if such application proposes that (a) not less than 51 percent of all funds available for the project shall be used for dwelling units and related facilities; and (b) not less than 30 percent of all funds used for dwelling units and related facilities shall be used for dwelling units to be occupied by persons of low and moderate income, or not less than 20 percent of all dwelling units made available to occupancy using such funds shall be occupied by persons of low and moderate income, whichever results in the occupancy of more dwelling units by persons of low and moderate income;

"(vi) the impact of the proposed activities on the fiscal base of the city or urban county and its relation to the amount of grant funds requested;

"(vii) the extent to which State or local Government funding or special economic incentives have been committed; and

"(viii) the extent to which the project will have a substantial impact on physical and economic development of the city or urban county, the proposed activities are likely to be accomplished in a timely fashion with the grant amount available, and the city or urban county has demonstrated performance in housing and community development programs; and

"(D) additional consideration for projects with the following characteristics:

"(i) projects to be located within a city or urban county which did not receive a preliminary grant approval under this section during the 12-month period preceding the date on which applications are required to be submitted for the grant competition involved; and

"(ii) twice the amount of the additional consideration provided under clause (i) for projects to be located in cities or urban counties which did not receive a preliminary grant approval during the 24-month period preceding the date on which applications under this section are required to be submitted for the grant competition involved.

If a city or urban county has submitted and has pending more than one application, the additional consideration provided by subparagraph (D) of the preceding sentence shall be available only to the project in such city or urban county which received the highest number of points under subparagraph (C) of such sentence.".

"(b) SELECTION LIMITATIONS AND CRITERIA WEIGHT.—Section 119(d) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(3) The Secretary shall award points to each application as follows:

"(A) not more than 35 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(A);

"(B) not more than 35 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(B);

"(C) not more than 33 points on the basis of the criteria referred to in paragraph (1)(C); and

"(D)(i) 1 additional point on the basis of the criterion referred to in paragraph (1)(D)(i); or

"(ii) 2 additional points on the basis of the criterion referred to in paragraph (1)(D)(ii).

"(4) The Secretary shall distribute grant funds under this section so that to the extent practicable during each funding cycle—

"(A) 65 percent of the funds is first made available utilizing all of the criteria set forth in paragraph (1); and

"(B) 35 percent of the funds is then made available solely on the basis of the factors referred to in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1).

"(5)(A) For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall hold—

"(i) 3 competitions for grants under paragraph (1) for cities not described in the first sentence of subsection (1) (relating to small cities) and urban counties; and

"(ii) 3 competitions for cities described in the first sentence of subsection (i) (relating to small cities).

"(B) Each competition for grants described in any clause of subparagraph (A) shall for an amount equal to the sum of—

"(i) approximately ⅓ of the funds available for such grants for the fiscal year;

"(ii) any funds available for such grants in any previous competition that are not awarded; and

"(iii) any funds available for such grants in any previous competition that are recaptured.".

(c) USE OF REPAID GRANT FUNDS.—Section 119(f) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In any case in which the project proposes the repayment to the applicant of the grant funds, such funds shall be made available by the applicant for economic development activities that are eligible activities under this section or section 104. The applicant shall annually provide the Secretary with a statement of the projected receipt and use of repaid grant funds during the next year to-

gether with a report acceptable to the Secretary on the use of such funds during the most recent preceding full fiscal year of the applicant.".

(d) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Section 119(r) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 is amended to read as follows:

"(r) In utilizing the discretion of the Secretary when providing assistance and applying selection criteria under this section, the Secretary may not discriminate against applications on the basis of (1) the type of activity involved, whether such activity is primarily housing, industrial, or commercial; or (2) the type of applicant, whether such applicant is a city or urban county.".

(e) REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1)(A) Not later than the expiration of the 6-month period following the date of enactment of this Act and every 3 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report evaluating the eligibility standards and selection criteria applicable under section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(B) Such report shall evaluate in detail the standards and criteria specified in such section that measure the level or comparative degree of economic distress of cities and urban counties and the effect of the grants awarded on the basis of such standards and criteria on stimulating the maximum economic development activity.

(C) Such report shall also evaluate in detail the extent to which the economic and social data utilized by the Secretary in awarding grants under such section is current and accurate, and shall compare the data used by the Secretary with other available data. The Comptroller General shall make recommendations to the Congress on whether or not other data should be collected by the Federal Government in order to fairly and accurately distribute grants under such section based on the level or comparative degree of economic distress. The Comptroller General shall also make recommendations on whether or not existing data should be collected more frequently in order to ensure that timely data is used to evaluate grant applications under such section.

(2) Not later than the expiration of the 3-month period following the date of the final competition for grants for fiscal year 1986 under section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing the effect of the amendments made by this section on—

(A) the targeting of grant funds to cities and urban counties having the highest level or degree of economic distress;

(B) the distribution of grant funds among regions of the United States;

(C) the number and types of projects receiving grants;

(D) the per capita funding levels for each city, urban county, or identifiable community described in subsection (p) of such section 119, receiving assistance under such section 119; and

(E) the stimulation of the maximum economic development activity.

(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section. Such regulations shall be published for comment in the Federal Register not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The provisions of section 119(d)(1)(D), section 119(d)(3), and section 119(d)(4) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall be applicable to the making of urban development action grants that have not received the preliminary approval of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development before the date on which final regulations issued by the Secretary under subsection (f) become effective. For the fiscal year in which the amendments made by this section become applicable, such amendments shall only apply with respect to the aggregate amount awarded for such grants on or after such effective date.

(h) FISCAL YEAR 1986 COMPETITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall hold—

(1) 2 competitions for grants under section 119(d)(1) for cities not described in the first sentence of subsection (i) of such section and urban counties; and

(2) 1 competition for such grants for cities described in the first sentence of subsection (i) of such section.

between April 15, 1986, and October 1, 1986.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on this motion under rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts opposed?

Mr. CONTE. To amendment 114, yes, I am opposed to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion for two very basic reasons. One is that the Senate amendment contains an extension of the FHA insuring authority to July 25, 1986, and a revision in the criteria for UDAG.

Now, the House approved House Joint Resolution 652 to extend FHA insuring authority until September 30, 1986, today. The House by action in passing H.R. 1, the housing authorization bill, on June 12, adopted the UDAG selection criteria that is contained in this amendment.

I rise in opposition to this motion on behalf of my colleagues on the Banking Committee on both sides of the aisle who have been engaged in lengthy processes of getting a housing bill passed. We have been involved in this process now for almost 2 years, and after extensive hearings, extensive markup, even more extensive negotiations with our Republican colleagues and 5 days of consideration on the floor of the House, we were able to pass the first freestanding housing bill since 1980.

The action taken by the conferees on H.R. 4515 would shortcircuit this bipartisan effort at putting together a housing authorization bill.

If the House defeats this motion to recede and concur, I will offer a motion that the House insist on its disagreement to amendment 114, and I certainly urge my colleagues to defeat the pending motion.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to make a point, very briefly.

I can see where, on occasion, there is a necessity to legislate on an appropriations bill, when the authorizing committees have not acted. In this instance the authorizing committee did indeed act in a very timely fashion.

The vote has been held. The bill is over in the Senate. I have been assured of the fact that the Senate will be entertaining a housing bill in the very immediate future. They just have to get rid of the tax bill.

So the reason we usually have for legislating in this manner on appropriations bills does not exist in this instance.

For that reason, I do hope we can vote against the acceptance of this amendment in disagreement.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that this represents one of the problems that we have. I would like to make some explanation to my colleagues. The Senate does not have a requirement on germaneness. When we go to conference, we end up dealing with all sorts of legislation added on that side. Out of 224 amendments added by the Senate, probably one-third of them contain legislation. It leaves us with a tough situation. In explanation of this provision here, I understand it was sought through this means to cause the Senate to come up with a housing bill. I am telling you that since it does not show on the sur-

face. I can understand how our colleagues on the Housing Committee want them to bring up the housing bill in the other body.

In view of the statements that they have gotten an agreement now and it will come up in the Senate, I have no desire to press the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, oppose the motion and support the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Rhode Island. We should not include UDAG legislation in this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Banking Committee is very familiar with the subject of UDAG selection criteria changes. It was hotly debated in both the subcommittee and full committee when we considered H.R. 1. Just 2 weeks ago the House debated the subject at length when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] offered an amendment to the housing bill that would have changed the allocation formula for UDAG grants. I was on the losing side of that vote and indeed I voted to discontinue UDAG's all together. My point is, however, that the House has worked its will in the appropriate way through authorizing legislation from the Banking Committee. The House has approved a housing bill and I am hopeful the other body will do so in the very near future. What is the rationale for allowing this one portion of our housing bill to be handled in an appropriation bill?

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I don't like UDAG's but that is beside the point. We fought that battle in the House and lost. We should continue to fight this out in the authorizing arena. If it looked like we were not going to get a housing bill, then the UDAG program could be considered in a separate bill. But let us keep authorizing provisions in the legislating committees.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that the outcome is not in doubt any more, but I, too, wanted to oppose the motion and support the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Rhode Island. We should not include UDAG legislation in this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Banking Committee is very familiar with the subject of UDAG selection. As has been pointed out, the House did work its will here a couple of weeks ago in H.R. 1. Whereas I was on the losing side of that vote, I do think that we should preserve the prerogative of the authorizing committee, especially in areas like this where there is considerable amount of technical discussion that needs to be had.

So I oppose the motion and support the gentleman from Texas and congratulate him for offering it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. The amendment apparently is giving considerable problems to Members on this side of the aisle and also on the other side of the aisle. I am willing to permit the House to work its own will.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was rejected.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GONZALEZ

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ moves that the House insist upon its disagreement with the amendment of the Senate numbered 114.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Amendment No. 120: Page 19, after line 17, insert: For an additional amount for "Land acquisition", $2,373,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, numbered 120 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for "Land acquisition, $2,373,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Amendment No. 122: Page 19, after line 21, insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $3,420,000, to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$3,850,000".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 128: Page 20, after line 12, insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payment for processing costs of data and information acquired by the Secretary on or after October 1, 1985, shall be made to permittees with permits issued on or before September 30, 1985.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for data and information acquired in fiscal year 1986 or thereafter, by the Secretary, pursuant to section 1352(a)(1)(C)(iii) of title 43, United States Code, payment shall be made for processing costs to permittees with permits issued on or before September 30, 1985."

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Amendment No. 131: Page 21, line 13, after "government" insert: : Provided further, That general assistance payments are subject to the availability of appropriated funds and hereafter such general assistance payments shall be reduced if the Secretary determines that reductions are necessary so as not to exceed the amounts available.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That the levels established for general assistance by Public Law 99-88 (99 Stat. 388), are the maximum allowable payments".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 21, after line 13, insert:

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $4,900,000, to remain available until expended.

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds previously appropriated under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs' Construction" in Public Law 98-8 (90 Stat. 20), $4,900,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1986.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds previously appropriated under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs' construction" in Public Law 98-8 (90 Stat. 20), $2,500,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1986.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 134: Page 21, line 18, strike out "Sections 177, 122, 221, and 223 of".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Sections 177, 122, 221, 223, 103(k), 105(c)(2), and 105(m) of".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 136: Page 21, line 20, after "99-239" insert ", and $9,340,000, to remain available until expended, for grants and necessary expenses to the Republic of Palau, to become available for obligation upon the enactment of S.J. Res. 325 or similar legislation".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 136 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", including $8,000,000 for initial capitalization of a trust fund to fund the Prior Service Benefits portion of the Trust Territory Social Security System in accordance with Section 105(m) of Public Law 99-239, and $2,750,000 for the Enjebi Community Trust Fund, as authorized in Section 103(k) of Public Law 99-239, and $9,340,000, to remain available until expended, for grants and necessary expenses to the Republic of Palau, to become available for obligation upon the enactment of S.J. Res. 325 or similar legislation".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 143: Page 23, after line 10, insert:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

SECTION 1. Provisions of 7 U.S.C. 147(b) shall apply to appropriations available to the Forest Service only to the extent that the proposed transfer is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 97-942.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

SEC. 1. Provisions of 7 U.S.C. 147(b) shall apply to appropriations available to the Forest Service only to the extent that the proposed transfer is approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with the reprogramming procedures contained in House Report 97-942.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 144: Page 23, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within funds made available by this Act or any other appropriations Act, release on behalf of the United States the condition described in subsection (b) of this section with respect to the tract of land described in subsection (c) of this section: Provided, That—

(1) the State of Georgia, acting by and through the Georgia State Properties Commission, enters into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture stating that the State of Georgia will convey the described tract of land to Brantley County, Georgia, for consideration determined adequate by

the Commission, and which consideration shall, if withdrawn from the account, be used exclusively for public purposes; and

(2) the State of Georgia shall pay into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts a sum of money which the Secretary of Agriculture deems sufficient to reimburse the administrative costs of releasing the condition pursuant to this subsection.

(b) The conditions to be released pursuant to subsection (a) of this section is the condition found in that certain deed dated March 30, 1955, which conveys from the United States to the State of Georgia, Georgia Forestry Commission, certain real property in Ware and Brantley Counties, Georgia, and which deed was recorded on May 17, 1955, in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Georgia, providing that the land conveyed be used for public purposes and that title to said land revert to the United States if it is not used for public purposes.

(c) The parcel of land to which the release provided for in subsection (a) of this section is described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land, situated, located and being in Land Lot. No. 128 in the 9th Land District of Brantley County, Georgia, being 55.04 acres, more or less, and being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the point where the centerline of the SCL Railroad tracks from Waycross to Brunswick intersects the centerline of that certain Brantley County paved road known as County Road No. 15, and thence N 08 degrees 54'00" W a distance of 97.72 feet to a point; thence, N. 79 degrees 40'50" E a distance of 40.02 feet to a point; thence, N 79 degrees 40'50" E a distance of 260.03 feet to a point; thence, N 68 degrees 30'00" E a distance of 390.0 feet to a point, this point being the point or place of beginning of the tract to be released from the described condition; thence, N 13 degrees 15'00" W a distance of 701.15 feet to a point; thence, S 73 degrees 10'00" W a distance of 647.09 feet to a point; thence, N 17 degrees 13'50" W a distance of 304.91 feet to a point; thence, N 61 degrees 23'03" E a distance of 2452.76 feet to a point; thence, S 06 degrees 09'26" E a distance of 275.29 feet to a point; thence, S 07 degrees 17'36" E a distance of 442.26 feet to a point; thence, S 00 degree 30'41" E a distance of 183.67 feet to a point; thence, S 12 degrees 11'06" E a distance of 160.31 feet to a point; thence, S 05 degrees 13'46" E a distance of 390.62 feet to a point; thence, S 34 degrees 53'42" W a distance of 201.01 feet to a point; thence, S 75 degrees 01'09" W a distance of 1371.18 feet to a point; this point being the point or place of beginning of the tract.

For a more complete description of the tract, reference is hereby made to that certain plat prepared on August 4, 1985, by Harry Strickland, Brantley County Surveyor, entitled "Survey for Brantley County" which plat is on file with the Georgia State Properties Commission.

(d) Section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011), shall not apply to the release provided for in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) The conveyance made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall reserve to the United States all gas, oil, coal and other mineral deposits as may be found in the lands conveyed by this section.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 144 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, within funds made available by this Act or any other appropriations Act, release on behalf of the United States the condition described in subsection (b) of this section with respect to the tract of land described in subsection (c) of this section: *Provided*, That—

(1) the State of Georgia, acting by and through the Georgia State Properties Commission, enters into an agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture stating that the State of Georgia will convey the described tract of land to Brantley County, Georgia, for consideration determined adequate by the Commission, and which consideration shall, if withdrawn from the account, be used exclusively for public purposes;

(2) the State of Georgia shall pay into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts a sum of money which the Secretary of Agriculture deems is sufficient to reimburse the administrative costs of releasing the condition pursuant to this subsection; and

(3) the State of Georgia shall provide to the United States the fair market value of the described tract of land, as determined by the Secretary, either in cash or by exchange of lands, waters, or interest therein.

(b) The condition to be released pursuant to subsection (a) of this section is the condition found in that certain deed dated March 30, 1955, which conveys from the United States to the State of Georgia, Georgia Forestry Commission, certain real property in Ware and Brantley Counties, Georgia, and which deed was recorded on May 17, 1955, in the Office of the Secretary of State, State of Georgia, providing that the land conveyed be used for public purposes and that title to said land revert to the United States if it is not used for public purposes.

(c) The parcel of land to which the release provided for in subsection (a) of this section is described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land, situated, located and being in Land Lot No. 128 in the 9th Land District of Brantley County, Georgia, being 55.04 acres, more or less, and being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the point where the centerline of the SCL Railroad tracks from Waycross to Brunswick intersects the centerline of that certain Brantley County paved road known as County Road No. 15, and thence N 08 degrees 54'00" W a distance of 97.72 feet to a point; thence, N 79 degrees 40'50" E a distance of 40.02 feet to a point; thence, N 79 degrees 40'50" E a distance of 260.03 feet to a point; thence, N 68 degrees 30'00" E a distance of 390.0 feet to a point, this point being the point or place of beginning of the tract to be released from the described condition; thence, N 13 degrees 15'00" W a distance of 701.15 feet to a point; thence, S 73 degrees 10'00" W a distance of 647.09 feet to a point; thence, N 17 degrees 13'50" W a distance of 304.91 feet to a point; thence, N 61 degrees 23'03" E a distance of 2452.76 feet to a point; thence, S 06 degrees 09'26" E a distance of 275.29 feet to a point; thence, S 07 degrees 17'36" E a distance of 442.26 feet to a point; thence, S 00 degree 30'41" E a distance of 183.67 feet to a point; thence, S 12 degrees 11'06" E a distance of 160.31 feet to a point; thence, S 05 degrees 13'46" E a distance of 390.62 feet to a point; thence, S 34 degrees 53'42" W a distance of 201.01 feet to a point; thence, S 75 degrees 01'09" W a distance of 1371.18 feet to a point; this point being the point or place of beginning of the tract.

For a more complete description of the tract, reference is hereby made to that certain plat prepared on August 4, 1985, by Harry Strickland, Brantley County Surveyor, entitled "Survey for Brantley County" which plat is on file with the Georgia State Properties Commission.

(d) Section 32(c) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011), shall not apply to the release provided for in subsection (a) of this section.

(e) The conveyance made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall reserve to the United States all gas, oil, coal and other mineral deposits as may be found in the lands conveyed by this section.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 154: Page 25, line 8 strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$1,800,000: *Provided*, That $1,530,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1986".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$13,500,000: *Provided*, That $1,530,000 shall not become available for obligation until September 30, 1986: *Provided further*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through grants and contracts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act of 1975 (88 Stat. 2203; 25 U.S.C. 450), shall remain available until September 30, 1987".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 155: Page 25, after line 8, insert:

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

(DEFERRAL)

Of the funds previously appropriated under this head, $13,745,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1986.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

"(DEFERRAL)

"Of the funds previously appropriated under this head, $11,665,000 shall not become available for obligation until October 1, 1986."

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 162: Page 25, after line 24, insert:

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Funds made available for fiscal year 1986 and hereafter to the Warren G. Magnuson Clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health shall be available for payment of nurses at the rates of pay and with the schedule options and benefits afforded nurses by the Veterans Administration pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4107.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 162 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Funds made available for fiscal year 1986 and hereafter to the Warren G. Magnuson clinical Center of the National Institutes of Health shall be available for payment of nurses at the rates of pay and with schedule options and benefits authorized for the Veterans Administration pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 4107.

Mr. CONTE. (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 163: Page 25, after line 24, insert:

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the District of Columbia, without cost, all rights, title, and interest in the property located at 425 Second Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia.

For making a grant to the District of Columbia upon the completion of the conveyance to the District of Columbia of the property located at 425 Second Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, and upon the submission of a request to the Office of Community Services, Department of Health and Human Services, by the District of Columbia, $5,000,000 for the repair and renovation of such property for use as a shelter for the homeless.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

SECTION 1. (a) The Administrator of General Services shall assign the property described in subsection (e) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for transfer of such property in accordance with this section to the District of Columbia for use as a shelter for homeless individuals in the District of Columbia.

(b) Immediately after the assignment of such property pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall transfer the title to such property without cost to District of Columbia for use as a shelter for homeless individuals.

(c) The deed of conveyance for the property described in subsection (e) shall provide that, if the District of Columbia sells, leases, or otherwise transfers such property to any other person or agency, a fraction of the proceeds of such sale, lease, or transfer (as determined under subsection (d)) may be retained by the District of Columbia for use in programs providing shelter and related services for homeless individuals in the District of Columbia and the remainder of such proceeds shall be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury and deposited as miscellaneous receipts of the United States.

Any sale, lease, or other transfer pursuant to this subsection shall be made after public advertising for bids or by other means designed to secure full and open competition.

(d) The fraction of such proceeds which may be retained by the District of Columbia for use in programs providing shelter and related services for homeless individuals in the District of Columbia shall be determined by dividing—

(1) the number of months that such property is used as a shelter for homeless individuals in the District of Columbia pursuant to this section prior to such sale, lease, or transfer; by

(2) 120,

except that such fraction shall not be greater than one.

(e) The property to which this section applies is the property located at 425 Second Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, more fully described as follows:

All that parcel situated in the Northwest quadrant of the City of Washington, District of Columbia, and being a portion of District of Columbia Square Number 571, containing in their entirety former lots numbered 9 through 18, inclusive, and 22 through 26, inclusive, as recorded in Liber B, Folio 160 of the Records of the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia, and lots 45 through 51 inclusive, as recorded in Liber 19, Folio 118 of the Records of the Office of the Surveyor for the District of Columbia; such land now known for purposes of assessment as Lot 820, and containing 1.16 acres of land, more or less; and more particularly described in a deed between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the United States of America, dated July 30, 1947, and recorded in Liber 8761, Folio 79 of the Land Records of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. For making a grant to the District of Columbia upon the completion of the conveyance to the District of Columbia of the property located at 425 Second Street, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, in accordance with section 1 and upon the submission of a request to the Office of Community Services, Department of Health and Human Services, by the District of Columbia, $1,500,000 for the repair and renovation of such property for use as a shelter for the homeless.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1825

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 168: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

Effective on October 1, 1980, section 3(d)(3) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is

amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C)(i) To the extent described in division (ii), the local contribution rate for a local educational agency shall include locally generated revenue in a State, without regard to the characterization of the locally generated revenue by the State, if the local educational agency receives amounts from such revenues for use by that agency and the remainder of such amounts are transferred to the State.

"(ii) For the purpose of clause (i) of subparagraph (A), the amount of revenues which are actually retained by a local educational agency described in division (i) may be counted in the determination of expenditures derived from local sources.".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

Effective on October 1, 1980, section 3(d)(3) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by adding after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

"(C) The local contribution rate for a local educational agency shall include current expenditures from that portion of a real property tax required to be levied, collected, and distributed to local educational agencies by county governments pursuant to state law where the remainder of such real property tax is transferred to the State."

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 172: Page 26, after line 18, insert:

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH

From the amounts appropriated to carry out the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, $29,300,000 shall be made available for special demonstration projects for the severely disabled under section 311: *Provided*, That $9,000,000 shall be used for supported employment demonstrations.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 172 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND HANDICAPPED RESEARCH

From the amounts appropriated to carry out the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, $27,945,000 shall be made available for special demonstration projects for the severely disabled under section 311: *Provided*, That $8,613,000 shall be used for supported employment demonstrations.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 175: Page 26, strike out all after line 19 over to and including line 4 on page 27.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

No Job Corps Center operating under part B of title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act shall be closed prior to July 1, 1987.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 176: Page 27, after line 6, insert:

SENATE

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For an additional amount for "Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper", $500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. (a) Effective October 1, 1985, the allowance for administrative and clerical assistance of each Senator from the State of Alabama is increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of four million but less than five million, the population of said State having exceeded four million inhabitants.

(b) Effective October 1, 1985, the allowance for administrative and clerical assistance of each Senator from the State of Florida is increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of eleven million but less than twelve million, the population of said State having exceeded eleven million inhabitants.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 110 of Public Law 97-12 (2 U.S.C. 58(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) striking out the last three sentences of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2)(A) Each Senator, at his election, may, during any fiscal year (but not earlier than July 1, thereof) transfer from such Senator's clerk hire allowance to his Official Office Expense Account such amounts as the Senator shall determine, but not in excess of the balance as of the end of the month which precedes the month in which the transfer is made. Any amount so transferred to a Senator's Official Office Expense Account shall be available for expenses incurred during the calendar year in which occurred the close of the fiscal year in which the transfer is made. Each Senator electing to make such a transfer shall advise the Senate Disbursing Office in writing, not later than January 15 of the calendar year immediately following the calendar year in which occurs the close of the fiscal year in which the transfer is to be made, and such transfer shall be made on such date (but not earlier than July 1, nor later than December 31, of the calendar year in which the close of such fiscal year occurs) as may be specified by the Senator.

"(B) Each Senator, at his election, may, during any calendar year (but not earlier than July 1 thereof) transfer from such Senator's Official Office Expense Account to his clerk hire allowance such amounts as the Senator shall determine, but not in excess of the balance as of the end of the month which precedes the month in which the transfer is made. Any amount so transferred to a Senator's clerk hire allowance during any calendar year shall be available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year which ends during the calendar year in which the transfer is made. Each Senator electing to make such a transfer shall advise the Senate Disbursing Office in writing, not later than September 30 of the calendar year in which the transfer is to be made, and such transfer shall be made on such date (but not earlier than July 1 of such calendar year) as may be specified by the Senator.".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 110 of Public Law 97-12 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Transfer of funds by a Senator under subsection (a) of this section shall be made between (1) the allowance of such Senator in the account (which is within the appropriation account under the headings 'SENATE' and 'Salaries, Officers and Employees') for 'Administrative, Clerical, and Legislative Assistance to Senators', and (2) such Senator's Senatorial Office Expense Account within the appropriation account

for 'Miscellaneous Items' under the heading 'SENATE'.".

(c) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective in the case of elections made with respect to transfers of funds to be available for expenses incurred after December 31, 1984.

SEC. 3. The Chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee of the Senate may, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, at his election, transfer not more than $30,000 from the appropriation account for salaries for the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority of the Senate, to the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable under section 120 of Public Law 97-51 (2 U.S.C. 61g-6). Any transfer of funds under authority of the preceding sentence shall be made at such time or times as such chairman shall specify in writing to the Senate Disbursing Office. Any funds so transferred by the chairman of the Majority or Minority Conference Committee shall be available for expenditure by such committee in like manner and for the same purposes as are other moneys which are available for expenditure by such committee from the account, within the contingent fund of the Senate, from which expenses are payable under section 120 of Public Law 97-51 (2 U.S.C. 61g-6).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 176 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Delete the second full sentence on page 66 of the Senate engrossed amendments.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask if someone could explain to me the nature of this amendment; it is not clear in the report what the amendment is.

Can someone explain to me what that is?

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for an explanation.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply some small housekeeping items over on the Senate side.

Mr. WALKER. Such as?

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, my notes say that this deletes duplicated language in the Senate housekeeping provisions.

Mr. CONTE. It authorizes some transfers between their accounts; it is strictly technical.

Mr. WALKER. OK. It is strictly technical; there is no substantive involvement?

Mr. CONTE. No; it is just housekeeping.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 179: Page 27, after line 16, insert:

CAPITOL POLICE

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

For an additional amount for the "Capitol Police Board", $13,000,000, to remain available until expended, to implement an improved security plan for the United States Capitol, after such plan shall have been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Public Works, and the House Committee on Administration: *Provided*, That such Board is authorized to transfer to the Architect of the Capitol so much of such funds as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out appropriate projects to implement such plan, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to obligate and expend the funds so transferred to him to carry out contracts entered into without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 179 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

CAPITOL POLICE

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

For an additional amount for the "Capitol Police Board", $13,000,000, to remain available until expended, to implement an improved security plan for the United States Capitol, after such plan shall have been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the Committee on House Administration: *Provided*, That upon approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, such Board is authorized to transfer to the Architect of the Capitol so much of such funds as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out appropriate projects to implement such plan, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to obligate and expend the funds so transferred to him to carry out contracts entered into without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended: *Provided further*, That before any such transfer of funds to the Architect of the Capitol takes place, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations shall review and approve detailed documentation describing the scope, cost and construction schedule of the work to be accomplished by the transfer of funds.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to inquire on this amendment whether or not the funding that we have put in here is in fact the funding to build the fence around the Capitol Building?

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] for his response.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is $13 million in the conference report but it was made very, very clear, while the conferees are including these funds in the bill, we are not mandating which security plan will be implemented. Questions about the details such as, "Will there be a fence around the Capitol or not?", are not resolved at all in this bill. Those questions will be dealt with by the appropriate authorizing committees and then, and only then, the Appropriations Committee will review the scope and cost estimates for approval, revision, or disapproval.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman but my problem comes from this: It is my understanding that the leadership has already agreed upon the very security plan that we are discussing here. That the amount of money for that security plan included $13 million to build a fence around the Capitol Building.

All of a sudden, the Appropriations Committee comes forward with a request for $13 million. Now there is an awfully suspicious hookup that takes place in one's mind when we know that there has been approval of a plan and this funding exactly matches what is said is needed to implement that plan.

Mr. CONTE. If the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman will look at page 68 of the conference report, it says:

* * * to remain available until expended, to implement an improved security plan for the U.S. Capitol, after such plan shall have been approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and the Committee on House Administration.

So it has to be approved by all of those panels, and as one, as the chairman of that legislative committee

knows, as one who is very, very skeptical about going along with a fence around this Capitol, I would not agree with that unless I was sure that it was going to go through the proper process.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I appreciate that but the fact is, it seems to me that with this $13 million we lose control over the money in the process because once those people have approved it, it says nothing about having to come to the House of Representatives again or to the Senate for approval. Once all of those people have signed off, there is enough money here to implement the plan that we have all heard about and it appears to me as though we are determining the amount of money to be spent here with no further approval needed by either the House or the other body in order to bring about that plan after these committees have signed off.

So you are putting the signoff authority in the hands of a committee rather than in the Houses of the Congress. That gives this gentleman some concern.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the comments made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. We clearly do not make the final decision here today. In fact, I am a skeptic about the fencing of the Capitol grounds as well. We are in fact informed that the total security package being discussed would require a $22 million expenditure. So this is certainly not all that would be required if we went with most, if not all, of the suggestions that have been made by one or another entity as to how we would improve security here in the Capitol.

I want to call the Members' attention to the fact that there is no mention in this amendment of the accompanying joint statement of a fence or kiosks or any other component of the plan that has been discussed by the whips. We really do retain the authority of the Congress in the normal authorizing and appropriating committees by the language that was agreed to in conference.

I would reassure the gentleman that this is not the last stop. The committees of jurisdiction will retain their authority.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman but is this gentleman not correct that if you are not one of the Members privileged to sit on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Appropriations, the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation or the Committee on House Administration, once we have approved this language, you have lost effectively your vote in whether or not we implement a security plan. That those people are going to make the decision and from now on in no one in the House is going to have any say in the process.

We are effectively taking the jurisdiction away from Congress and putting it in the hands of a few committees of Congress to make this determination. Is that not a correct interpretation of this?

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield, I think only you could correctly interpret this is to say that the Congress is supportive of additional security improvements in the Capitol area. We have not agreed yet within the normal process as to what those security improvements should be and we, therefore, give endorsement to the whips in terms of making improvements, but this does not sign off on any specific approach. That will be done, as I indicate, by the authorizing committees of jurisdiction and, as Mr. CONTE has said, a very skeptical Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WALKER. But we are giving a signoff to these committees to make that determination rather than allowing the House to make the determination.

Mr. FAZIO. Clearly these committees of jurisdiction have the most to say about the subject area, and have spent the most time studying it thus far. I think they can represent the views of the body very well.

Mr. WALKER. I agree with the gentleman on that, the problem being that we are turning over the final decision now to these committees with this determination. We are not going to allow the House Members to make that final determination. So that if you are not on one of these committees and there is a decision made to build a fence, and these committees sign off on that by a majority vote in each of these committees, the House will have lost its ability to have any say in this if we approve this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not prepared to agree with the gentleman because, as I indicated earlier, it may well be that the cost of the security improvements in the Capitol will be far beyond this $13 million figure. The House retains its authority in the context of any additional funds that would be required. Certainly those would come before the body for approval I do not think we know for certain what recommendations will come before these authorizing and appropriating committees or what they will produce in terms of an outcome.

Mr. WALKER. Why was the $13 million figure picked? That just happens to be the figure that I have seen speculated about that would be the cost to build the fence. Why was $13 million used when that just happens to be that projected cost?

Mr. FAZIO. I would indicate that the fence is not expected to cost $13 million. As I understand it, that would cost well below that. In fact, that is why the next amendment which goes to the study done by the Architect of the Capitol is so important because that study may give us cost information on these items. That will help guide us in the future.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 180: Page 27, after line 17, insert:

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For an additional amount for "Office of the Architect of the Capitol, Salaries", $250,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 180 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SALARIES

For an additional amount for "Office of the Architect of the Capitol, Salaries", $250,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred to the appropriation "Capitol Grounds", and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to obligate and expend funds so transferred only for the detailed design and cost estimates associated with the construction aspects of the congressional joint leadership proposal to improve security of the Capitol and the House and Senate office buildings.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 182: Page 28, after line 3, insert:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses under the headings "OTHER AGENCIES" and "LIBRARY OF CONGRESS", $1,000,000: Provided, That of such amount, $500,000 shall remain available until expended for the acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials (including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$867,000".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1835

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 184: Page 28, after line 9, insert:

Of the approximately $750,000 in savings available from the Great Point Light, Nantucket, Massachusetts project, such sums as necessary shall be applied to the maintenance, sealing and preservation of other lighthouses in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts owned by the Coast Guard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 184 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

Out of available funds, the Coast Guard shall make available not more than $750,000 for maintenance, sealing and preservation of lighthouses in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 186: Page 28, strike out all after line 13 down to and including "contracts" in line 26 and insert "$80,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 186 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$84,250,000 of which $2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Coast Guard, Retired pay", and $2,250,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Coast Guard, Research, development, test, and evaluation": *Provided*, That, if by July 15, 1986, the Secretary of Transportation and the appropriate governmental authorities of Dade County, Florida, have not reached agreement on the execution of a full funding contract for the project identified in Section 320 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986, the memorandum of understanding submitted by the Metro-Dade Transportation Administration to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration on June 6, 1986, shall be deemed approved by the Secretary and shall be binding on the Department of Transportation and Metropolitan Dade County upon acceptance by the appropriate Dade County governmental authorities: *Provided further*, That such memorandum of understanding shall be deemed approved by the Secretary notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. Sections 4321 through 4335 inclusive, and applicable regulations".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follow:

Senate amendment No. 187: Page 28, line 26, after "contracts" insert ": *Provided*, That, at a minimum, the air traffic control on-board employment level shall be 14,480 by September 30, 1986".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That, at a minimum, the air traffic control on-board employment level shall be 14,480 by September 30, 1986".

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN.]

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 192: Page 29, strike out lines 1 to 6.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 192 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken, amended to read as follows:

RELATED AGENCY

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Panama Canal Commission, Operating expenses", $18,300,000, of which $17,181,000 may be available either for operating expenses or for vessel accident claims as authorized by Public Law 99-209, and $1,119,000 shall be available for payment to the Republic of Panama, pursuant to article XIII, paragraph 4(c) of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 199: Page 30, after line 4, insert:

SEC. 4. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act shall be used to

implement temporary Internal Revenue Service Regulation section 1.274-5T or section 1.274-6T or any other regulation issued reaching the same result as, or a result to, such temporary regulations.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 199.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the gentlewoman is reserving the right to object?

Ms. FIEDLER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have the motion read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the motion.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee to please make a full explanation to the House on the details of this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk has completed the reading of the motion.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

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

I have moved that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 199. As I pointed out earlier, we have to face many legislative provisions on the Senate side, and occasionally the only way to get them out is to bring them back in true disagreement.

We are opposed to this amendment, the Ways and Means Committee is opposed to it, but under the Senate rules they could add it. So we brought it back here so the Members could help us defeat it.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object, would the chairman make an explanation of the specific details of the disagreement with the Senate?

Mr. WHITTEN. What we do with the Senate amendment, which is legislation, is agree to disagree with them on it, and we brought it back so the Members could help us vote it down, take it out.

Ms. FIEDLER. This deals with the issue of comtemporaneous recordkeeping on the part of the IRS; is that not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is correct.

Ms. FIEDLER. And if the House were to insist upon its position, is it not true then that that contemporaneous recordkeeping which the House voted overwhelmingly in opposition to would be permitted to be enacted into law in the event that it were insisted upon?

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not understand the gentlewoman, if I may ask.

Ms. FIEDLER. I am sorry; we are having a mutual problem here. Is it not true that in the event the House supported the chairman's motion, the contemporaneous recordkeeping which is required by this amendment would be put into effect as opposed to receding to the Senate's position, which would mean that that no longer would be required by the IRS?

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say that I am not too familiar with the legislation, but the amendment is legislation, and we strike the amendment, so whatever the law is now would continue, since we strike this amendment, which would change it, so we ask that the Members help us defeat it.

Under our rules, this is against the rules; under the Senate rules, it is not. The only way we can get it out is to bring it back and vote it down. So my motion was to strike it, which leaves the existing law as it is.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, continuing to reserve the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will be aware that the time is controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER].

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned about this particular provision, this amendment, because I am concerned about the fact that we will require extensive recordkeeping on the part of the American citizens by the IRS even though the House voted overwhelmingly against this particular provision when it came to the House, and therefore, I am concerned about it being permitted to move into law when there has been an overwhelming statement against it, plus the overwhelming response from the public regarding this contemporaneous recordkeeping requirement. Therefore, I would like to have the opportunity to prevent this from becoming permanent law, since there appears to be not only strong opposition on the part of the House Members, but also strong opposition on the part of the citizenry of the country.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentlewoman will yield, I can appreciate her feelings in the matter, but that is another thing. What we have here is the Senate provision, and under the rules of the House, "* * * no bill or joint resolution carrying a tax or tariff measure shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction * * *." That clearly hits this.

The Senate provision will be stricken if my motion is approved. I would not attempt to interpret what the present law is. I agree with the gentlewoman, and I do not want any changes made in the direction which she is opposed to.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield,

Ms. FIEDLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman correctly pointed out that when this matter was before the House, at the time that the tax bill was considered, the House did overwhelmingly take the position that the gentlewoman says that it took.

As it happens, that matter is before the Senate now in the tax bill, and it is my understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means has demanded—not asked, but demanded—that the conferees strike this out so that they can consider it as a part of the conference on the tax bill.

As of just a few moments ago, in response to the housing question, where the legislative committee said that it was considering that matter, the Appropriations Committee withdrew its intervention; so is the Appropriations Committee attempting to withdraw its intervention in this instance as well to permit the legislative committee to attack this problem. And that is the reason that the chairman is attempting to carry out that action.

Ms. FIEDLER. Is it the gentleman's understanding then that there will be an opportunity for the House to work its will, which is overwhelmingly in opposition to this particular provision of the law, sometime in the near future?

Mr. YATES. The gentlewoman knows as well as I that Members have nothing to say about individual matters. The Ways and Means Committee can make that a matter for our consideration by singling it out, but ordinarily neither the gentlewoman nor I nor any Member of the House can do anything but accept what the Ways and Means Committee gives us as a package in the whole tax bill.

Ms. FIEDLER. I would simply like to say that were it not for the fact that this would hold up the entire bill, I would object, but I will not object, because of the implications on the balance of this particular bill. I would simply urge those Members who are

making decisions on this issue not to violate the intent of the House on this issue when the opportunity comes up for a real vote on it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. FIEDLER) for her graciousness in not asking for a record vote. If the motion was rejected, it would have really held up the whole supplement. As you heard earlier, they have curtailed civil jury duties in the Federal courts. I guess that is good for some defendants, but not the plaintiffs. Many other agencies and programs require immediate attention.

Let me just suggest to the gentlewoman from California that if the Committee on Ways and Means fails to act on this issue, she has the opportunity to offer a similar amendment to the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill soon after the Fourth of July recess. The House can work its will at that time. I agree with the gentlewoman from California on this issue.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], on the Committee on Ways and Means, would have objected to this had we tried to take it. We assured him that we were going to move to strike it, which we have done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 216: Page 31, strike out lines 6 to 9.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 216 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 203. None of the funds in this Act, or any other Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1986, may be used to implement changes to OMB Circular A-21 made subsequent to February 11, 1986: *Provided*, That this provision shall expire 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The amendment reads as follows:

Senate amendment No. 218: Page 31, after line 25, insert:

SEC. 206. Notwithstanding section 514 of Public Law 99-178, amounts appropriated by that Act for Federal financial assistance to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be available, as would have been available had the Compact of Free Association Act (Public Law 99-239) not been enacted, until alternative funding is available under the terms of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-239). Thereafter, except insofar as the Compact of Free Association Act otherwise provides, such amounts shall be available only for the Republic of Palau, but only in amounts that such Republic would have received had the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 not been enacted.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WHITTEN

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

SEC. 207. Notwithstanding section 514 of Public Law 99-178, amounts appropriated by that Act for Federal financial assistance to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be available, as would have been available had the Compact of Free Association Act (Public Law 99-239) not been enacted, until alternative funding is available under the terms of the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-239). Thereafter, except insofar as the Compact of Free Association Act otherwise provides, such amounts shall be available only for the Republic of Palau, but only in amounts that such Republic would have received had the Compact of Free Association Act of 1985 not been enacted.

Mr. CONTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and the several motions was laid on the table.

## FOUR NEW DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-238)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, June 24, 1986.)

□ 1845

## ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, 1985—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science and Technology:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Tuesday, June 24, 1986.)

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on, Senate Joint Resolution 365, which passed the House today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## CARDINAL OBANDO Y BRAVO IS THE REAL LEADER IN NICARAGUA

(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, I'd like a recent editorial from the Washington Post written by Cardinal Obando Bravo to appear at this point in the RECORD.

Most Americans do not know who Obando Bravo is. He is Catholic. He is a cardinal. He is head of the Catholic Church in Nicaragua. He is the real leader of the majority of people in Nicaragua. The Marxist Sandinistas call him a Somocista, a rightwing. Somoza called him a Communist. The people call him leader.

Cardinal Obando Bravo opposes the Sandinistas allowing the Soviet Union and Cuba to use his country as base from which to terrorize, destabilize and export, and I quote, "a revolution without borders." He knows what the Sandinistas want to do to his country and he wants everyone else to know too.

It shouldn't surprise anyone, then, that the Sandinistas have confiscated the cardinal's Catholic newspaper, banned him from television, and clamped down on his travels and talks. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic Church has taken a lead in opposing the Marxist totalitarianism in Nicaragua. That opposition is lead by Cardinal Obando Bravo.

Mr. Speaker, you should recognize that. The Maryknoll nuns should recognize that. U.S. church groups should recognize that. Liberation theology is a fraud exploited by the Marxists for their totalitarian propaganda purposes.

Ortega may be the official leader of the Marxist Communists, but Cardinal Obando Bravo speaks for Nicaraguan people.

NICARAGUA: THE SANDINISTAS HAVE "GAGGED AND BOUND" US

(By Miguel Obando y Bravo)

Your message asking me for an article arrived on Sunday, April 13, just as I finished celebrating Mass, and my first decision was not to grant your request. I must not confuse my pastoral mission with others, however worthy, such as politics or journalism, which are different from the mission that our Lord has entrusted to me. But, I am not obligated to keep silent either. As a man, as a citizen, as a Christian and even as a bishop, I have certain duties that I must fulfill and these duties compel me to grant your request.

In the Mass I just celebrated, I had to announce, with great sorrow, that some of the offices of the Curia, occupied by the State Security Police since October 1985, had been confiscated by government order, despite the fact that they were built on land occupied by the Apostolic Nunciature.

In these offices there was a small printing press donated by the German Bishops' Conference, which was used to print our bulletin "Iglesia," a strictly intra-ecclesiastical publication. Both the press and the bulletin were seized by the State Security Police, along with all the files, including baptismal records and my own personal seal.

During the Mass, I read the pastoral letter which we, the bishops of Nicaragua, had written for Holy Week. The pulpit was now our only means of disseminating information, because the letter was totally censored and pulled from the pages of the newspaper La Prensa, the only private newspaper in the country, which attempted to publish it, but in vain. We believe that the reason for the censorship was that for the second time we called all Nicaraguans to reconciliation and dialogue as the only way to peace.

It was also announced that the Sunday bulletin with the prayers and texts for the day would not be available because it was confiscated and that my Sunday address would not appear in La Prensa, which, under the heading "The Voice of Our Pastor," had been published for many years in that newspaper, because it too had been censored, despite the special care taken to exclude from it anything that could serve as the remotest excuse for censorship.

"Radio Catolico," the only Catholic radio station had been closed by the State several months earlier. It was at this point, when the Church was gagged and bound, that your request arrived.

The reading for the day, taken from the Acts of the Apostles, was about an incident that pricked my conscience. The Sanhedrin sent for Peter and John, intending to force them into silence. "But Peter and John said to them in reply: 'Is it right in God's eyes for us to obey you rather than God? Judge for yourselves. We cannot possibly give up speaking of things we have seen and heard' " (Acts 4:18-20).

I felt then that I ought to tell the truth and speak as a prophet speaks, even at the risk of being a "voice that crieth in the wilderness." I would explain to those that have ears to hear the sensitive situation of our Church and the serious danger we place ourselves in simply by speaking out.

I am reminded of the incident related in the 22nd chapter of Matthew: "Then the Pharisees went away and agreed on a plan to trap him in his own words." The method they chose was to appeal hypocritically to His spiritual authority, saying: "Master, you are an honest man, we know; you teach in all honesty the way of life that God requires. . . . Give us your ruling on this: are we or are we not permitted to pay taxes to the Roman emperor?" Jesus was aware of their malicious intention and said to them: "You hypocrites! Why are you trying to catch me out?"

History repeats itself, and this is the situation of the Nicaraguan Bishops, a situation that we denounced in our recent pastoral letter. An appeal is made to our moral authority and to our position as spiritual leaders of the people. We are asked to make a statement on an extremely sensitive political matter, but the real objective is not to seek moral guidance, but rather to use our statement to manipulate opinion.

If Jesus had answered that taxes should be paid to Caesar, He would have become a collaborator of the occupying Roman imperialists. If He had answered no, he would have become a criminal and an agitator who violated the laws of the land. If He had not answered at all, He would have lost His authority in the eyes of the people.

We are asked to issue a statement against U.S. aid to the insurgents. The state-controlled communications media, the organizations of the masses in the service of the system and their allies in the so-called People's Church and the minister of Foreign Affairs, Father Miguel d'Escoto, are all clamoring for our statement. But, as I mentioned, it is not moral guidance that is sought, since on several occasions our Conference of Bishops has already stated that it was against any outside interference, whether by the United States or the Soviet Union. (Pastoral letter of April 22, 1984). The intention is to use the statement to manipulate.

While no effort was spared in suppressing our earlier statements, this statement would be given international publicity. Not for the faithful—but for the U.S. Congress. But we are not pastors to the Congress of the United States.

If we were to support military aid to the insurgents, we would be persecuted as traitors. If we opposed aid, we would be accused of taking sides, which would automatically disqualify us as pastors to all of the people. If we remain silent, our silence would be considered guilty, the silence of complicity.

It can be argued that the U.S. Conference of Bishops has more than once issued statements on political matters. But there is one big difference: the U.S. bishops' statements are made freely, they are addressed to their own people and their purpose is to provide moral guidance. They can make such statements in complete freedom, and they can give their reasons, with full access to the communications media. Their words are not censored, twisted or distorted. But above all, their statements do not make them criminals and traitors to their country.

In Nicaragua any dissident from the Sandinista cause can be placed outside the law through an ingenious distortion of the truth:

The government, with all the media under its control, has taken great pains to convince the outside world that what is happening is essentially a direct attack by the United States on our country. That there is a war, open or covert, between the two countries, and, consequently, any form of assistance to the enemy, whether material or moral, is punishable by law.

Along the same lines, and with equal insistence, it rejects both the idea that an East-West conflict has made of our country a disposable card, a pawn in the game between the superpowers, and the reality of a civil war: an enormous number of Nicaraguans oppose with all their might the turn taken by a revolution that has betrayed the hopes of the Nicaraguan people and even its own promises.

To accept the reality of an East-West conflict would be to admit that the Sandinistas are just as much the tools of Soviet interests as the insurgent forces are of the United States. If this is accepted, aid from the one is equally as deplorable as aid from the other. It would necessitate the withdrawal of the Soviet and Cuban advisors, as well as the withdrawal of all U.S. military aid.

If the reality of an internal conflict between Nicaraguans is admitted, the conclusion could not be avoided that the insurgent dissidents are now in the same position that the Sandinistas themselves once occupied, and, consequently, that they have the same right that the Sandinistas had to seek aid from other nations, which they in fact did request and obtain in order to fight a terrible dictatorship.

To accept this would mean giving the insurgents the title of "rebels," a title that the Sandinistas proudly gave to themselves in former days.

The only possible argument against this is that unlike the Somozan dictatorship, which the Nicaraguan people fought almost unanimously, this is a democratic government, legitimately constituted, which places the interests of the Nicaraguan people above any ideological struggle or international cause, seeks the welfare and peace of the people and enjoys the support of an overwhelming majority.

Unfortunately, this is not true either. To accept this as the indisputable truth is to ignore the mass exodus of the Miskito Indians, who, on numerous occasions, fled in the thousands, accompanied by their bishop, Salvador Schlaeffer. It is also to ignore the departure of tens of thousands of Nicaraguan men and women of every age, profession, economic status and political persuasion. It is to ignore that many of those who are leaders or participants in the counterrevolution were once leaders or members of the Sandinista front or were ministers in the Sandinista government. It is to ignore the lack of any justification for the most terrible violation of freedom of the press and of speech in the history of our country. It is to ignore the progressive and suffocating restriction of public liberties, under the cover of an interminable national emergen-

cy law and the continual violation of human rights. It is to ignore the expulsion of priests and the mass exodus of young people eligible for military service . . . None of this is true of a government that has the sympathy and general support of the people.

And this is what the Nicaraguan bishops wish to state:

"It is urgent and essential that the Nicaraguan people, free of foreign interference or ideologies, find a way out of the situation of conflict that our country is experiencing.

"We reaffirm today, with renewed emphasis, what we said in our pastoral letter on Easter Sunday, April 22, 1984:

"Foreign powers are taking advantage of our situation to promote economic and ideological exploitation. They view us as adjuncts to their own power, without respect for our persons, our history, our culture and our right to determine our own destiny.

"Consequently, most of the Nicaraguan people live in fear and are uncertain about the future. They feel deeply frustrated. They cry out for peace and freedom, but their voices go unheard, drowned out by militaristic propaganda on every side.

"We feel that any form of assistance, regardless of the source, which causes the destruction, suffering and death of our families, or which sows hatred and discord among the Nicaraguan people is reprehensible. To choose annihilation of the enemy as the only possible way to peace is inevitably to choose war."

The Church proposes reconciliation through dialogue as the only real solution, the only way to peace, and maintains, in the words of His Holiness John Paul II, in his visit to El Salvador in March 1983, that this dialogue ". . . is not a delaying tactic to strengthen positions prior to continuing a fight, but rather a sincere effort to respond, by seeking appropriate solutions to the anxiety, the pain, the weariness and the fatigue of the many who yearn for peace. The many who wish to live, to rise again from the ashes, to seek warmth in the smiles of children, free from terror and in a climate of democratic cooperation."

This is the text that was censored by the Sandinista government.

We are asked to issue a statement against aid, the Church and the position of our Conference of Bishops, which is trying to guide the Church through turbulent waters, more by the spirit than by the natural sciences and politics of man, which do not seem to hold any solution for such difficult problems. We are in a difficult situation, but we place our faith and trust in the Lord Jesus, the Prince of Peace and the Lord of History.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I was called away on congressional business on Tuesday, June 24, but had I been here, I would have voted "aye" to H.R. 4060, the bill that requires COLA payments to Federal retirees to be made irrespective of any other legislation.

I was a cosponsor of this bill because I felt it was unreasonable that Social Security COLA's were maintained under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act, while Federal and postal employees were not given the same protection. Such disparate treatment of private sector versus civil service retirees defies any rational explanation and is patently unfair. H.R. 4060 has my full support.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 160 on Thursday, June 12, 1986. Had I been present on the House floor, I would have cast a "yea" vote for approval of the House Journal of Wednesday, June 11.

## THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise my colleagues that I have asked for a special order tomorrow to discuss our recent meeting with Mexican parliamentarians.

We have by law, by the way, only two of these between the United States and another country, with Canada and with Mexico.

We meet once a year, once in Mexico and once in the United States. We try to meet away from the capital cities so that we may be away from the pressures and the responsibilities that we have here.

This last meeting was the 26th consecutive meeting and we held it in Colorado Springs, CO. It was a very successful meeting with representatives from all the parties in the Mexican Government and, of course, here from our two parties, there was representation from the Senate and from the House.

We have done in the years that I have served as a member of this parliamentary or interparliamentary group, we have done yeoman work, if I might say so myself.

Some of the problems that have existed between Mexico and the United States that were very serious problems were first mentioned at one of these meetings, the Colorado salinity problem that was eventually resolved, the Chamizal question that eventually became a treaty between our two countries, the salinity of the Lower Rio Grande in my adjacent area was resolved, or the initiation of the resolution was made at this meeting.

I would like to mention this one specifically because it shows how two nations working together with good will and with frankness and in a direct and forceful manner can solve problems that at other times could not be solved in any other nation or adjoining nations.

There was a stream coming from the Mexican side of the river into the Rio Grande with millions of cubic feet of salt. It was ruining the water below that entry point to everyone down river on the Rio Grande. The solution that was arrived at by the engineers was that there be a dam placed before the water reached the Rio Grande River and that there be a channel built some 70 miles to the Gulf of Mexico on Mexican soil. It was paid for one-half by the Government of Mexico, one-fourth by the IBWC, the International Boundary and Water Commission, which would have been, of course, U.S. taxpayers' money, and the other fourth was paid by the water users on the United States side of the river below the dam.

This is what you can do. The solution was solely on the territory of one country. The benefit would be divided, one-half to the two countries and it was paid for one-half by one country and one-fourth by our country and one-fourth by the users.

We had at this meeting in Colorado discussions, of course, on various and sundry matters affecting our two countries.

One of the things that I personally derived from the discussions, both public and private, with our Mexican colleagues, and this I say so only as myself, speaking for no one but myself, they have tremendous problems in Mexico at this time, fiscal problems, budgetary problems. They have a tremendous external debt.

I would commend President de la Madrid for some of the steps which he has taken, austerity measures, in spite of potential harm to the very poor in Mexico, but steps that he was forced to take by imposition from the IMF or other areas to whom they owe their external debt; but the clear message that I perceived from our Mexican colleagues is that at this point in time they need friends. They need friends who can understand their plight, can understand their political situation and can understand their fiscal situation and that it is well and good for friends to be frank with each other, but that it is not a time to criticize or to say, "If you don't do this, or you don't do that, then your system is going to fail or any assistance we could give you won't be triggered."

I sort of sympathize with them that if we would look back to our country and to our time of need, let us say to a time when I can vaguely, but nontheless remember, the Great Depression, and if our friends from across the seas in other countries would have started criticizing President Roosevelt and saying, "No, that is the wrong approach," or, "No, you have to cut here or you have to cut there or you have possibly corruption in your Government," that is not the time that you appreciate that coming from a good friend.

So they looked annoyed with some of the actions taken in our country and they sort of—not questioned, because they know of our friendship, they never questioned our friendship, but they asked, "Why now, bringing out things perhaps if you had done earlier, it would have made us work better toward achieving this goal."

So that is one of the areas that we have to be very cautious in, because the problems of Mexico where I live become our problems and a failure of any system or a failure in any area of the economic sectors of Mexico right away impacts on our side of the border.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting me interrupt him.

The only thing that motivates me is that I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks. I have gotten up on two previous occasions on the House floor and have deplored the counterproductive statements that have been made by highly placed administrative officials, in which the reputation and the integrity of the head of state of the Mexican Government, President de la Madrid, has been questioned.

I deplored it very much because it is a slander. It is a libel.

President de la Madrid, as we know from the beginning, has earned a reputation of being one of the most soberminded and honest of administrators.

I just think that what the gentleman is saying is so important that I want to go on record as reinforcing and reaffirming and backing the gentleman up in the statements he is making. They are very valuable and I hope that many of our Members if they are not listening to us on the closed circuit, will read the RECORD tomorrow because what has happened here by these administrative badly advised spokesmen has been very, very detrimental to our relationships, not only with Mexico, but most of Latin America.

I want to thank the gentleman for his very, very perceptive report and the remarks he is making in connection with this situation.

□ 1900

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman, and I might mention to my colleagues that the gentleman has made valuable contributions in the Inter-Parliamentary Group and also here. I appreciate the fact that he has mentioned it because when a friend is in trouble, it is not right to tell them, "Well, your President is a crook," or "This fellow is a crook." They need help and they need constructive help.

I have seen many areas of cooperation. I mentioned one, that salinity problem, and we are cooperating in many other endeavors.

But what will the Central American nations that we are trying to win to our side, if we call it that, who want our friendship, what will the South American nations that need our help and admire our leadership, admire our system—one of them once called it "this intricate, mysterious thing called democracy that seems to work so well in the United States." That is what we are trying to instill in some of these people beyond our borders.

But to be calling every official, or to be challenging their veracity, or their morals, or their ability to function in government is no way to treat a friend and is no way to treat an ally.

I would hope that our colleagues would take heed of what we are trying to do here in that here we have a friend, here we have an ally. Yes; we have had problems. Yes; we have had very serious problems. We went to war. We invaded Mexico and we took two-thirds of their territory, and now when they are down on their knees, possibly going lower, we should not be leveling accusations at them. We should help in a fair and constructive way.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5052, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-653) on the resolution (H. Res. 481) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5052) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4184, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1987 AND 1988

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-654) on the resolution (H. Res. 482) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4184) to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal years 1987 and 1988, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4259, GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK ADDITION

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-655) on the resolution (H. Res. 483) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4259) to amend the act of February 11, 1895 (28 Stat. 651), to authorize the donation of certain non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2436, NATIONAL NUTRITION MONITORING AND RELATED RESEARCH ACT OF 1985

Mr. BEILENSON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-656) on the resolution (H. Res. 484) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2436) to establish a coordinated National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Program, and a comprehensive plan for the assessment of the nutritional and dietary status of the United States population and the nutritional quality of the United States food supply, with provision for the conduct of scientific research and development in support of such program and plan, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## FREE TRADE MUST BE FAIR TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, free trade must be fair trade. Last month's unemployment figures again reveal the startling evidence that America desperately needs a comprehensive, effective jobs and international trade policy. In May, our Nation lost a record 40,000 manufacturing jobs. Fifteen thousand of last month's job loss came in the automotive sector alone. That means that since 1984, America has seen 300,000 more good jobs disappear from our shores. Is someone at the White House tuned in?

Since the House passed the most far-reaching and balanced trade bill in decades last month, the administration has responded with cheap rhetoric and superficial analysis. Do they not see the dramatic erosion in our manufacturing base? Why are they so wedded to their do-nothing policy? Why is appeasement the game plan of the White House?

Mr. President, give America an opportunity to implement a real game plan to deal with our trade deficit. Give the House bill an honest review and work with us, not so we can say, "we told you so," but so America's auto, steel, textile, lumber, high tech, energy, and machine tool workers can say to their families—"I am going back to work." Let this be their Independence Day celebration.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absense was granted to:

Mr. ECKERT of New York (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), 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. DE LA GARZA, for 10 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONNELLY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUKEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TORRES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, on June 25.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. LUJAN, on amendment No. 91 to the conference report to H.R. 4515, in the House, today.

Mr. CONTE, on Senate amendment 93 to the conference report on H.R. 4515, in the House, today.

Mr. DONNELLY, after amendment No. 84, to the conference report to H.R. 4515, in the House, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. LENT in two instances.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. WORTLEY.
Mr. PARRIS.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.
Mr. BROYHILL.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. GRADISON.
Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. COBEY.
Mr. COURTER in two instances.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. SOLOMON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DONNELLY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAWKINS.
Mr. EVANS of Illinois.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. GARCIA in two instances.
Mr. DELLUMS.
Mr. GORDON.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. SUNIA.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. LEVINE of California.
Mrs. BURTON of California.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.
Mr. STUDDS.
Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. DONNELLY.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. PEASE.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. MICA.
Mr. DYSON.

## SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 186. An act to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine by requiring that certain mail of the United States be carried on vessels of U.S. registry; to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating August 12, 1986 as "National Neighborhood Crime Watch Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 274. Joint resolution to designate the weekend of August 1, 1986, through August 3, 1986, as "National Family Reunion Weekend"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to designate the week of December 14, 1986, through December 20, 1986, as "National Drunk and Drugged Driving Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to designate July 2, 1986, as "National Literacy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning July 27, 1986, as "National Nuclear Medicine Week," and

H.J. Res. 652. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to housing and community development, and for other purposes.

## SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to designate July 6, 1986, "National Air Traffic Control Day";

S.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to designate July 4, 1986, as "National Immigrants Day";

S.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution to designate June 21, 1986, as "National Save American Industry and Jobs Day"; and

S.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution to designate 1987 as the "National Year of the Americas."

## ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1986, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3769. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting information on the proposed amendment on Central America to the military construction appropriations bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3770. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 86-11, finding that the furnishing, sale and/or lease of defense articles and services to the Governments of Cape Verde, Mauritania, and Guinea-Bissau will strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace, and a copy of the accompanying Memoranda of Justification; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3771. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense—Comptroller (Administration), transmitting notification of a new computer matching program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3772. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the fiscal year 1985 report of the activities of the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office and the American Folklife Center, and accompanied by a copy of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board annual report, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 139, 20 U.S.C. 2106(b), and 2 U.S.C. 163; to the Committee on House Administration.

3773. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the fiscal year 1985 annual report of the Board of Directors of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4127; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3774. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the program development plan for antarctic living marine resources, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 2441; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3775. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the seventh annual report on the progress made in administering the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program through December 31, 1985, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 144(i); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

3776. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a revised fiscal year 1987 design prospectus, pursuant to Public Law 86-249, section 7(a) (86 Stat. 217); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation..

3777. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting revised projections for the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Programs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2) 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3778. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 1985 annual report on the Commission's operation of the U.S. Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, section 163(b); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of his remarks, which he had hoped to deliver to Members of the House of Representatives, concerning the importance of achieving a bipartisan approach with respect to providing assistance to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua (H. Doc. No. 99-237); Jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. Report on revised allocations of subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1986 (Rept. 99-651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Government Operations. Army 9 mm. handgun contract with Beretta Corp. should be terminated (Rept. 99-652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONIOR: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 481. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 5052, a bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes (Rept 99-653). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 482. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4184, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal years 1987 and 1988, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-654). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. BURTON of California: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 483. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4259, a bill to amend the Act of February 11, 1895 (28 Stat. 651), to authorize the donation of certain non-Federal lands within the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park (Rept. 99-655). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALL of Ohio: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 484. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2436, a bill to establish a coordinated National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Program, and a comprehensive plan for the assessment of the nutritional and dietary status of the United States population and the nutritional quality of the United States food supply, with provision for the conduct of scientific research and development in support of such program and plan (Rept. 99-656). 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 Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 5072. A bill to establish a Federal Council on Women; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself), Mr. LENT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROYHILL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BATES, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. TORRES, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. COURTER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SABO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HORTON, Mr. REID, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. ST GERMAIN):

H.R. 5073. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate regulations requiring inspection for asbestos-containing material in the Nation's schools, development of asbestos management plans for such schools, response actions with respect to friable asbestos-containing material in such schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 5074. A bill to extend the effective period of the International Coffee Agreement Act of 1980 until October 1, 1989; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARTNETT:

H.R. 5075. A bill to authorize the acquisition of certain real property located in Charleston, SC, for a tour boat facility for Fort Sumter National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 5076. A bill to renew authority to contract for the detection and treatment of drug-dependent offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 5077. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain methods of concealing the proceeds of crime, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LENT (for himself and Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi):

H.R. 5078. A bill to establish an asbestos information clearinghouse in the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARLENEE (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 5079. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Montana by quitclaim deed certain lands in the Coal Creek State Forest, Flathead County, MT; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 5080. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to reduce the need for emergency assistance payments to provide temporary housing for destitute and homeless AFDC families, and the expense of such payments, by authorizing grants to States for the construction or rehabilitation of permanent housing that such families can afford with their regular AFDC payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself and Mr. KEMP):

H.R. 5081. A bill to authorize additional economic and military assistance for the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. FASCELL):

H. Con. Res. 361. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress respecting the admission of certain Cuban expolitical prisoners into the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

H. Res. 485. Resolution directing the President to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning activities of Lt. Col. Oliver North or any other member of the staff of the National Security Council in support of the Nicaraguan resitance; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Res. 486. Resolution calling for the elimination of funding of former Secretary General Kurt Waldheim's retirement allowance from the United Nations budget; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. RUDD, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. STARK, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. WEBER, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. COBEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MONSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. BONKER, and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska):

H. Res. 487. Resolution impeaching Harry E. Claiborne, Chief Judge of the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, of high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY:

H.R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Valerie S. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 5083. A bill for the relief of Travis D. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 5084. A bill providing for the transfer of certain real property in Lincoln County, NE; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 479: Mr. STRANG.

H.R. 585: Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BADHAM, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 891: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 893: Mr. DE LUGO and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 979: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1213: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1402: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1474: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2700: Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 2741: Mr. WYDEN and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2867: Mr. BARNES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 2902: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2952: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3564: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 3646: Mr. HENDON.

H.R. 3647: Mr. HENDON.

H.R. 3648: Mr. HENDON.

H.R. 3649: Mr. HENDON.

H.R. 3894: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SHARP, Mr. FROST, Mr. CARR, Mr. WISE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. COATS, and Mr. STRANG.

H.R. 4041: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 4142: Mr. MCCURDY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SABO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DERRICK, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 4153: Mr. WISE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. RODINO, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COELHO, Mr. MICA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. BARNES.

H.R. 4194: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4280: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4299: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. SWINDALL.

H.R. 4300: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 4311: Mr. TORRES, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 4338: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. BATES, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 4344: Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 4424: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4425: Mr. WHITEHURST and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 4430: Mrs. BURTON of California and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4433: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 4439: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. STRANG.

H.R. 4469: Mr. KOLTER, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4482: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. CARR.

H.R. 4512: Mr. HENDON and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 4559: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.R. 4625: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 4638: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 4650: Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 4655: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 4660: Mr. MACKAY.

H.R. 4671: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. CARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HOPKINS.

H.R. 4681: Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 4714: Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 4715: Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TAUKE, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 4734: Mr. EDWARDS of California and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4766: Mr. STRANG and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 4812: Mr. HYDE and Mrs. BYRON.

H.R. 4818: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REID, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 4825: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 4827: Mr. RODINO and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4838: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4853: Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.R. 4871: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 4872: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 4876: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. COBEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 4877: Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 4882: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HAYES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 4933: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

H.R. 4934: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WISE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. GAYDOS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio.

H.R. 4935: Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LELAND,, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4953: Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4984: Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

H.R. 5035: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 5050: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CARR, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.J. Res. 7: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. BEVILL Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.J. Res. 231: Mr. CONTE.

H.J. Res. 524: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.J. Res. 547: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WISE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MOLINARI, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 558: Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H.J. Res. 577: Mr. MANTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. BATES.

H.J. Res. 617: Mr. SABO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. GRAY of

Illinois, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 623: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BATES.

H.J. Res. 631: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. COATS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.J. Res. 642: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ROE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. NICHOLS.

H.J. Res. 647: Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 664: Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. MACK, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. STRANG, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COATS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. OBEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. COBEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ZSCHAU, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. REID, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. HILER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. DELAY, Ms. FIEDLER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. DAUB, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CHAPMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. [BOGGS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RUDD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. RAY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DARDEN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WALKER, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. YATES, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SHARP, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. SHUMER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MACKAY.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TORRES.

H. Con. Res. 330: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 331: Mr. PENNY, and Mr. ARMEY.

H. Con. Res. 353: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BONKER, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H. Res. 373: Mr. STUDDS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H. Res. 404: Mr. STRANG.

H. Res. 461: Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FIELDS and Mr. PICKLE.

H. Res. 468: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. REID, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HENDON, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. COELHO, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. BERMAN.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

403. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mr. Grover A. Perrigue, III, of Pasadena, CA, relative to the national insurance crisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

404. Also, petition of the Council of the Village of Glenwillow, OH, relative to recognition of "Save American Industry/Jobs Day;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

### H.R. 4613

By Mr. ENGLISH:

—On page 12 following line 22, insert a new subparagraph (e) as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act or any rule, regulation or order of the Commission, any state may adopt any statute, rule, regulation or order to prohibit, in that state, the offer, sale, or confirmation of any transaction described in subsection (a) and permitted under subsection (b). Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any state may enforce any state statute, rule, regulation or order adopted in accordance with this subsection against any person in a state court or administrative proceeding."

### H.R. 5052

By Mr. HAMILTON:

—Strike out title II (as added to the bill pursuant to the rule) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE II

UNITED STATES POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 201. (a) The primary objectives of United States policy in Central America should be—

(1) to preserve the security of the United States;

(2) to prevent the Soviet Union and its allies from seeking to destabilize the region or to develop or deploy an offensive military capability which directly threatens the United States;

(3) to achieve peace and reconciliation;

(4) to promote stability and economic development;

(5) to promote the observance of human rights and the strengthening of democratic processes; and

(6) to live at peace with Nicaragua so long as Nicaragua lives at peace with its neighbors.

(b) United States strategy for achieving the objectives stated in subsection (a) should include—

(1) an emphasis on seeking a negotiated, regional settlement;

(2) respect for the independence and territorial integrity of all nations;

(3) a clear commitment, through appropriate types and levels of military and economic assistance, to assist the nations of Central America in building and sustaining viable, democratic societies capable of withstanding aggression and subversion and of providing their people with an opportunity for better lives; and

(4) consistent diplomatic support on behalf of the observance of human rights by groups and governments, and support for democratic institutions throughout the region, in recognition of the fact that subversion feeds on repression.

(c) In furtherance of the objectives stated in subsection (a), United States policy with respect to Nicaragua should include the following:

(1) A commitment to preserve the security of the United States by preventing the Soviet Union and its allies from developing or deploying an offensive military capability in Central America that directly threatens the United States.

(2) A commitment to protect the security and territorial integrity of any nation of Central America in conformance with the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which provide for collective action.

(3) Pursuit of a regional settlement through all diplomatic avenues, including—

(A) effective support for the Contadora process, which is addressing the questions of peace and security (including mechanisms for verification and enforcement) and internal reconciliation and political pluralism;

(B) giving priority to obtaining a ceasefire in Nicaragua;

(C) renewing bilateral talks with Nicaragua; and

(D) encouraging direct talks among the parties to the conflict in Nicaragua.

(4) The provision of incentives to Nicaragua if the Government of Nicaragua agrees to a ceasefire with its opponents, removes foreign military advisors, agrees not to provide material support for insurgencies and agrees to appropriate monitoring procedures under Contadora auspices to verify such agreement, respects human rights and the independence of the media, and makes progress toward national reconciliation and a pluralistic democratic system. Incentives should be structured to enable the United States to respond to positive steps by Nicaragua. These incentives could include—

(A) the suspension of United States military exercises in the region;

(B) the termination of the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua which the President declared in Executive order 12513 on May 1, 1985, and termination of the United States embargo against Nicaragua instituted pursuant to that Executive order;

(C) the resumption of normal trade, including the resumption of nondiscriminatory trade treatment (MFN status), the restoration of benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences, and the restoration of Nicaragua's sugar quota;

(D) the provision of bilateral and multilateral assistance for Nicaragua and the provision of technical assistance, help in agriculture and health, and volunteer services; and

(E) the creation of a Central American Development Organization (in accordance with section 464 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961) in which Nicaragua could participate.

(5) The imposition of further sanctions against Nicaragua should it intensify or expand activities hostile to United States interests and to peace and security within Central America. Such sanction could include obtaining the cooperation of our allies in Western Europe and Japan, now Nicaragua's largest trading partners, in—

(A) cutting trade with Nicaragua;

(B) stopping bilateral assistance and blocking multilateral assistance to Nicaragua;

(C) imposing comprehensive economic sanctions against Nicaragua;

(D) breaking diplomatic relations with Nicaragua; and

(E) working with our Latin American allies, especially those in Central America, to isolate Nicaragua in regional affairs.

Such sanctions can only be effective if taken together with our allies. Unilateral sanctions have not and will not be effective.

SUPPORT FOR THE CONTADORA PROCESS

SEC. 202. (a) The Congress reaffirms its support for the Contadora initiatives and processes, particularly the principles for peace outlined in the Document of Objectives of September 9, 1983, and the Caraballeda Declaration of January 12, 1986. These include termination of support for irregular forces in the region, termination of support for insurrectionist movements in the region, negotiated limits on arms acquisitions, negotiated limits on international military maneuvers, progressive reduction toward elimination of foreign military advisers, effective steps toward national reconciliation and observance of human rights, commitment by the Central American nations to avoid aggression, and promotion of regional integration and cooperation.

(b) In accordance with the Carabelleda Declaration of January 12, 1986 (which was signed by the foreign ministers of all four Contadora nations and all four Contadora Support Group nations), and the Guatemala Declaration of January 16, 1986 (which was signed by all five Central American nations), the Congress urges the President to resume without preconditions direct bilateral talks with Nicaragua, which were suspended by the United States in January 1985.

(c) The Congress calls upon the President, in order to show support for the Contadora process, to announce that when all five Central American nations have signed an agreement based on the Contadora Document of Objectives, the United States will respond by taking positive steps, which could include—

(1) supporting and observing that agreement;

(2) limiting the scope, duration, and locale of United States military exercises in Central America to those allowed by that agreement; and

(3) terminating the national emergency with respect to Nicaragua which the President declared in Executive order 12513 on May 1, 1985.

ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF THE REGIONAL PEACE PROCESS

SEC. 203. (a) The Congress urges the President to support the regional peace process in Central America with diplomatic and financial assistance.

(b)(1) The President is authorized and encouraged to use up to $5,000,000—

(A) to provide assistance to the Contadora nations of Mexico, Panama, Venezuela, and Colombia, and the Contadora Support Group nations of Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, and Brazil, to assist those nations in reaching agreement among the nations of Central America based on the Contadora Document of Objectives, including assistance for peacekeeping, verification, and monitoring systems; and

(B) to help implement any joint border commission agreement between Nicaragua and Costa Rica, or between Nicaragua and Honduras, which those nations enter into in furtherance of the purposes of the Contadora Document of Objectives.

(2) In addition to funds transferred pursuant to section 205, the $2,000,000 appropriated under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A CONTADORA AGREEMENT" by the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1985, may be used to carry out paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) In addition, the Congress urges the President, at such time as an agreement based on the Contadora Document of Objectives is signed by all five Central American nations, to request such funds as may be necessary to assist in the implementation of that agreement.

ASSISTANCE FOR HUMANITARIAN NEEDS AND RESETTLEMENT

SEC. 204. Up to $27,000,000 of the funds authorized to be transferred by section 205 may be made available for use as follows:

(1) Except for amounts used pursuant to paragraph (2), these funds shall be used to provide food, medicine, or other assistance for the humanitarian needs of those who have been displaced by conflict in Nicaragua, regardless of whether they have been associated with the Nicaraguan opposition forces. Assistance under this paragraph may be provided only through the International Committee of the Red Cross or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and only upon that organization's determination that such assistance is necessary to meet humanitarian needs.

(2) Up to $15,000,000 of these funds may be used for the resettlement of members of the Nicaraguan opposition forces (and their families) who have terminated their military activities.

TRANSFER OF DOD FUNDS

SEC. 205. The President may transfer up to $30,000,000 of the funds appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1986 (as contained in Public Law 99-1900), for use in carrying out section 203(b)(1) and section 204 of this Act. The funds transferred under this section may include funds that have been made available for obligation beyond September 30, 1986, as provided by law.

REPORTS ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 206. No less frequently than once every 3 months, the President shall submit to the Congress a written report containing an accounting of any funds used pursuant to section 203 or 204.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CONTADORA

SEC. 207. (a) There is hereby established the National Commission on Contadora (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall—

(1) monitor and review the efforts of the Contadora nations to achieve a political resolution to the conflicts in Central America; and

(2) make recommendations with a view to building a consensus on United States policy toward Nicaragua.

(b) The Commission shall consist of an even number of members, such number to be determined jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate, who shall each appoint half of the members of the Commission. A vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) Not later than January 31, 1987, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and to the Congress with respect to its findings and recommendations. This report shall include—

(1) a detailed review of the status of the Contadora negotiations and United States support for those negotiations;

(2) a determination by the Commission of whether the Government of Nicaragua and the Nicaraguan opposition are facilitating the Contadora process;

(3) a recommendation on policies toward Nicaragua which the Commission believes represent a consensus that is sustainable and is supportable by the American people; and

(4) a recommendation on policies which the Commission believes will enhance peace and security throughout Central America.

(d) Members of the Commission shall receive no compensation on account of their service on the Commission, but while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of their duties on the Commission, shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e)(1) The Commission may employ experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) Upon a request by the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may temporarily assign employees of that agency to the Commission to assist the Commission in carrying out this section.

(f) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

(g) Funds for the expenses incurred by the Commission in carrying out this section, including travel expenses, shall be provided by Secretary of State.

PRESIDENTIAL REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO NICARAGUA

SEC. 208. (a) After considering the recomendations of the National Commission on Contadora contained in the report submitted pursuant to section 207(c), the President may submit to the Congress on or after January 31, 1987, a request for authority to take specified actions with respect to Nicaragua. The request must be accompanied by—

(1) the President's assurance that he has consulted with the Contadora nations and the Contadora Support Group nations concerning the proposed actions; and

(2) a description of the response of the Contadora nations and the Contadora Support Group nations to the proposed actions.

(b)(1) The provisions of this subsection apply, during the first session of the 100th Congress, to the Consideration in the House of Representatives of a joint resolution with respect to the request submitted by the President pursuant to subsection (a).

(2) For purposes of this subsection, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution introduced within 3 legislative days after the Congress receives the request submitted by the President pursuant to subsection (a)—

(A) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress hereby authorizes the President, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to take those actions with respect to Nicaragua which are specified in the request submitted to the Congress pursuant to title II of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1987.";

(B) which does not have a preamble; and

(C) the title of which is as follows: "Joint Resolution relating to Nicaragua pursuant to title II of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1987.".

(3) A joint resolution shall, upon introduction, be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives.

(4) If all the committees of the House to which a joint resolution has been referred have not reported the same joint resolution by the end of 15 legislative days after the first joint resolution was introduced, any committee which has not reported the first joint resolution introduced shall be discharged from further consideration of that joint resolution and that joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar of the House.

(5)(A) At any time after the first joint resolution placed on the appropriate calendar has been on that calendar for a period of 5 legislative days, it is in order for any Member of the House (after consultation with the Speaker as to the most appropriate time for the consideration of that joint resolution) to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of that joint resolution. The motion is highly privileged and is in order even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to. All points of order against the joint resolution under clauses 2 and 6 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House are waived. If the motion is agreed to, the resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the House until disposed of. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disagreed to shall not be in order.

(B) Debate on the joint resolution shall not exceed ten hours, which shall be divided equally between a Member favoring and a Member opposing the joint resolution. A motion to limit debate is in order at any time in the House or in the Committee of the Whole and is not debatable.

(C) An amendment to the joint resolution is not in order.

(D) At the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise and report the joint resolution back to the House, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

(6) As used in this subsection, the term "legislative day" means a day on which the House is in session.

(7) This subsection is enacted—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such it is deemed a part of the Rules of the House, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in the House in the case of a joint resolution, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change its rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House, and of the right of the Committee on Rules to report a resolution for the consideration of any measure.

---

H.R. 5052

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

—Page 3, line 1, strike out "$1,364,090,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,224,290,000."