HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 29, 1989*

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.—Romans 8:28.

We thank You, gracious God, for all Your promises, especially for the promise that in everything Your will can be accomplished and work together for our good and the good of those we seek to serve. We pray, O God, for the faith to believe, the hope to sense Your purpose, and the love that casts out fear. Bless all those, O God, who act for Your purposes by doing justice, loving mercy, and by walking humbly with You. This we pray. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG] lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LONG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESIGNATION AS CONFEREE AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 1278, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS REFORM, RECOVERY, AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1989

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a conferee:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 29, 1989.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I wish to be excused as a conferee on the "Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989" (H.R. 1278).

Thank you for your courtesy and consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES] as an additional conferee on the bill, H.R. 1278, to fill the vacancy resulting from the resignation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointment as a member of the National Women's Business Council:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 5, 1989.

Hon. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 403(a)(3) of Public Law 100-533, I hereby appoint Ms. Marilu Meyer of Chicago, Illinois, to serve as a member of the National Women's Business Council.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

FURTHER APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S BUSINESS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 403(a)(3) of Public Law 100-533, the Chair appoints the following individuals to the National Women's Business Council, on the part of the House:

Mrs. Esther Shapiro, Los Angeles, CA; and Ms. Gilliam Rudd, Washington, DC.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, SATURDAY, JULY 1, 1989, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2461, DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL, 1990

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight Saturday, July 1, to file its report on H.R. 2461, the fiscal year 1990 defense authorization bill.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1989

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 179 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2655.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2655) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes, with Mr. SKELTON of Missouri (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, June 28, 1989, title IX was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 28, 1989, amendments offered to section 707 that are otherwise in order pursuant to House Resolution 179 and the previous order of the House of Wednesday, June 21, 1989, may be offered notwithstanding that title VII has been passed in the reading of the bill for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 28, 1989, debate on amendments offered to section 707 and all amendments thereto will be limited to 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Subject to clause 6, rule XXIII, and the additional 30 minutes provided for section 707 amendments, there are 2 hours and 31 minutes of debate remaining on all amendments.

Are there any amendments to title IX?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, just to make a parliamenta-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ry inquiry so I am sure that we are protected later this afternoon, we are taking a break for the 213th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and Fourth of July. Will we be able to make 1 minutes at the end of business today before we break on this long district work period?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Speaker advises that 1-minute speeches will be in order after the conclusion of this bill.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the Chair.

□ 1110

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SKELTON). The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

En bloc amendments offered by Mr. FASCELL:

Page 515, after line 16, insert the following:

(e) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES GRANTED.—

(1) EARMARKINGS OF FUNDS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section supersedes any provision of this Act or the annual Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act that earmarks funds for a specific country, region, organization, or purpose.

(2) APPROPRIATION ACT LIMITATIONS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section supersedes any provision of the annual Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act that specifically refers to the assistance authorized by this section and establishes limitations with respect to such assistance.

(3) REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section supersedes the requirements of section 4304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any provision of the annual Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act that requires prior notification to congressional committees of proposed reprogrammings of funds.

Page 515, after line 16, insert the following:

(f) LINKAGE OF TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND ITS LETHAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE KHMER ROUGE.—

(1) CONDEMNATION OF CHINESE ASSISTANCE TO KHMER ROUGE.—The United States condemns assistance provided by People's Republic of China to the National Army of Democratic Kampuchea.

(2) LINKAGE.—When considering requests for transfers of high technology to the People's Republic of China, the United States shall take into account the degree to which the People's Republic of China has reduced its assistance to the Khmer Rouge.

(3) SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC LAW 100-502.—The President should reiterate his support for Public Law 100-502, which calls for blocking the return to power of the Khmer Rouge.

(4) REPORT.—The President shall report to the Congress within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act regarding the degree to which the People's Republic of China is decreasing its assistance to the Khmer Rouge.

Page 520, line 25, strike out "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—"; and page 521, strike out lines 4 through 19 (including paragraph (3) as added by the amendments offered en bloc by Mr. Fascell of Florida on June 21, 1989).

Page 525, after line 16, insert the following:

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) there are still over 2,300 Americans unaccounted for in Southeast Asia;

(2) by not knowing the fates of their loved ones, the families of those unaccounted for in Southeast Asia have suffered tremendous hardship;

(3) the United States made a commitment that resolving the fates of Americans unaccounted for in Southeast Asia was a matter of the highest national priority; and

(4) the United States must reaffirm that commitment and fulfill its promise to the families of our missing Americans.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should—

(1) continue to give the highest national priority to accounting as fully as possible for Americans still missing in Southeast Asia and to negotiating the return of any Americans still held captive in Southeast Asia; and

(2) heighten public awareness of the Americans still missing in Southeast Asia through the dissemination of factual data, including access to records to primary next of kin concerning reported live sightings of Americans missing in Southeast Asia, to the extent that the disclosure of such records does not reveal sources and methods of intelligence collection.

Page 525, line 17, strike out "It is the" and insert in lieu thereof "(c) SUPPORT OF HUMANITARIAN PROJECTS IN LAOS.—It is the further".

Page 526, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 910. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD THE ONE-CHILD-PER-FAMILY PROGRAM AND FORCED ABORTION POLICIES OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1979 the People's Republic of China adopted a one-child-per-family policy that purports to protect voluntary decisions by couples on matters relating to family planning but in reality relies on coercion, economic penalties, and forced abortions (often late in pregnancy) for refusal to comply;

(2) this one-child-per-family policy, implemented by the use of forced abortions and involuntary sterilizations, has been used against ethnic minorities and peoples, such as the Tibetans, by Chinese authorities in Tibet;

(3) as a direct result of this one-child-per-family policy, the incidence of female infanticide in the People's Republic of China has escalated, particularly among those living in rural areas who regard a male as vital to their economic well being and a source of financial security in retirement;

(4) the one-child-per-family policy of the People's Republic of China makes use of a repressive "birth quota" system that empowers family planning workers to dictate to couples if and when they may have the one child permitted under the policy;

(5) the People's Republic of China's family planning workers violate a woman's right to privacy by monitoring private details of a woman's life, including the onset of menstruation in order to track compliance with the one-child-per-family policy;

(6) numerous reports by social scientists and by journalists associated with the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Public Broadcasting System "Nova" series, the Columbia Broadcasting System's "Sixty Minutes" and other media, have documented pervasive reliance by local People's Republic of China officials on forced or coerced abortion in order to achieve birth quotas for specified areas;

(7) reports indicate that, as a result of the one-child-per-family policy, tens of millions of unborn children have been killed by abortion in the People's Republic of China;

(8) the policy of the Department of State for the 1984 International Conference on Population stated that, "Attempts to use abortion, involuntary sterilization, or other coercive measures in family planning must be shunned, whether exercised against families within a society or against nations within the family of man", and the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child issued in 1959 calls for the legal protection of children before birth as well as after birth;

(9) at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, forced abortion was regarded as a "crime against humanity"; and

(10) while "official" People's Republic of China policy forbids infanticide, prosecution has been virtually nonexistent except in a few token cases.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the continued violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of the People's Republic of China, including—

(A) the one-child-per-family policy adopted in 1979 that relies on coercion, economic penalties, and forced abortions (often late in pregnancy) as a means of enforcing compliance;

(B) the continued use of a repressive "birth quota" system that empowers the authorities to dictate to couples if and when they may have a child; and

(C) the use of forced abortions and involuntary sterilizations of Tibetans by Chinese authorities in Tibet;

(2) affirms internationally recognized basic human rights, such as—

(A) the conclusion made by the 1981 United Nations Symposium on Population and Human Rights that compulsory abortion is a violation of human rights; and

(B) the declaration made at the Nuremberg war crimes trials that forced abortion be regarded as a "crime against humanity"; and

(3) asks that the President and the Department of State—

(A) raise the concerns expressed in this section with the Government of the People's Republic of China, and

(B) calls upon that Government to cease immediately this repressive policy.

Page 526, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 911. ASSISTANCE TO DISPLACED BURMESE STUDENTS ALONG THE THAI-BURMA BORDER.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, $2,000,000 of the funds described in subsection (b) shall be used for humanitarian assistance for displaced Burmese students on both sides of the Thai-Burma border. Such assistance may include the provision of food, medicine, medical supplies, medical training, and clothing.

(b) FUNDS WHICH MAY BE USED.—The funds which are to be used pursuant to subsection (a) are any funds that are made available for fiscal year 1990—

(1) for development assistance, economic support assistance, or international disaster assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, excluding funds that are earmarked for a specific country, region, organization, or purpose;

(2) to carry out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1961; or

(3) to carry out the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962.

(c) CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS NOT APPLICABLE.—Section 3262 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply with respect to the humanitarian assistance for displaced Burmese students provided for in this section.

(d) REPROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section supersedes the requirements of section 4304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any provision of the annual Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriation Act that requires prior notification to congressional committees of proposed reprogrammings of funds.

Page 526, after line 24, insert the following:

SEC. 912. ANNUAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING ARMS TRANSFERS BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA TO IRAN, IRAQ, LIBYA, AND SYRIA.

In any calendar year, sales may not be made to the People's Republic of China under the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, and licenses may not be issued under section 38 of that Act for the export to the People's Republic of China, of any item on the United States Munitions List unless the President has certified to the Congress that—

(1) no United States defense article or technology (including United States licensed technology) was used in—

(A) any cruise missile or ballistic missile,

(B) any advanced fighter aircraft, or

(C) any major component or technology for any such missile or aircraft,

that was transferred, directly or indirectly, to Iran, Iraq, Syria, or Libya by the People's Republic of China in the previous calendar year in contravention of the Arms Export Control Act or regulations issued under section 38 of that Act; and

(2) no chemical weapons, and no materials, equipment, or technology intended for use in a nuclear program, was transferred, directly or indirectly, to Iran, Iraq, Syria, or Libya by the People's Republic of China in the previous calendar year.

Page 527, line 7, immediately before the comma insert the following: "and for the development and implementation of long-range bilateral and multilateral reconstruction efforts for Afghanistan and the establishment of a broad-based freely-elected Afghan government".

Page 530, strike out line 15 and all that follows through line 7 on page 531 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) India and Nepal, building on the offer of negotiations that the Government of Nepal has made and India has apparently accepted, should schedule without delay a time and place for talks by the two governments to resolve, on an urgent basis, issues relating to trade and transit between the two countries, recognizing that an expeditious and amicable resolution is in their mutual self-interest;

(2) India, as a gesture of good will befitting a responsible regional power, should consider resuming the sale of petroleum products to Nepal and encourage the normal passage of people and goods into and out of Nepal; and

(3) the Secretary of State, or his designee, should provide regular briefings to the Congress regarding the effects of the Indian-Nepalese dispute on the two countries and on the interests of the United States with respect to both countries and in South Asia in general.

Page 535, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 925. REMOVAL OF MINES IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Soviet military forces engaged in armed hostilities against the people of Afghanistan for over 9 years.

(2) The hostilities in Afghanistan have resulted in extensive loss of life and property and economic dislocation for large numbers of the Afghan people.

(3) During the course of the conflict in Afghanistan millions of explosive mines, made of both plastic and metal, where planted or scattered throughout the Afghanistan countryside, and those mines have injured or killed thousands of men, women, and children.

(4) Many of the mines the Soviet Union and the Afghan regime deployed in Afghanistan will remain active for many years, creating extreme obstacles for refugees in returning to Afghanistan and making use of their land.

(5) The millions of refugees now living in Pakistan burden that country's young democracy.

(6) One of the terms of the agreement governing the withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Afghanistan guarantees the safe passage and return of Afghan refugees to their homeland.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Soviet Union should continue to agree to abide by the letter and spirit of the agreement governing the withdrawal of its military forces from Afghanistan;

(2) the Soviet Union should make available all information regarding the location of all minefields as well as information regarding areas in which mines were scattered by means of artillery or aircraft, or other means, and this information should be widely disseminated by all available methods to the Afghan people both in Afghanistan and in refugee camps outside the country;

(3) the Soviet Union should provide generous support to the efforts of the United Nations to remove mines in Afghanistan and to continue to do so until such time as it has been established that all reasonable steps for the identification, location, and removal of mines have been taken;

(4) the Soviet Union should also provide generous and long-term support for United Nations efforts toward the reconstruction in Afghanistan including medical care and assistance to those Afghan people injured as a result of Soviet and Afghan Government placement of mines; and

(5) consistent with United States efforts to provide humanitarian assistance to civilians who have suffered as a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the President should continue to provide assistance as he deems necessary in support of the international mine clearing effort.

Page 535, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 926. REGIONAL ACTIVITIES BY INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Soviet Union remains the main external supplier of military equipment to India, and India has obtained sophisticated Soviet weaponry such as MiG-29 fighter bombers, Mi-29 Halo heavy lift helicopters, and Soviet built nuclear submarines. India and the Soviet Union also coproduce T-72 tanks and MiG-21 and MiG-27 fighters.

(2) India recently tested a medium-range missile that could be capable of carrying either conventional or nuclear warheads.

(3) India has not agreed to submit to international safeguard inspections on its nuclear activities.

(4) India continues to recognize and support the Communist Government of Afghanistan, despite that government's abysmal record on human rights and its complete lack of legitimacy among its own people.

(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress urges the Government of India—

(1) to end its support for the Communist Government of Afghanistan; and

(2) to agree to submit to international safeguard inspections of its nuclear activities and to become a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Page 535, after line 10, insert the following:

SEC. 927. UNITED STATES POLICY ON THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) nearly 10 years after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and despite the February 1989 withdrawal of Soviet troops, a Soviet-installed regime that is unrepresentative of the Afghan people is still in place in Kabul; and

(2) the Soviets continue to provide massive quantities of military supplies to the Kabul regime, and have increased their arms shipments through a major airlift in recent months.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to encourage a political settlement that will bring an end to the fighting in Afghanistan without sacrificing the objectives of genuine Afghan self-determination, return of refugees, and the reemergence of an independent Afghanistan; and

(2) the United States should continue to provide effective military support to the Afghan resistance in order to enable them to respond to the massive Soviet resupply effort and to negotiate from a position of strength, thereby helping to ensure a political solution that meets the desires of a majority of the Afghan people.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer, jointly with my colleague Mr. BROOMFIELD, an en bloc amendment concerning U.S. policy toward various Asian nations. The amendment includes:

First, language suggested by Mr. MRAZEK requiring congressional notification for any assistance provided to the Cambodian resistance;

Second, provisions offered by Mr. DORNAN of California linking United States technology transfer to China to a decrease in assistance from China to the Khmer Rouge forces and requiring certification of People's Republic of China arms transfers to Iran, Iraq, Libya, and Syria;

Third, Mr. SOLARZ' amendment deleting the transfer authority for funding for the multilateral assistance initiative for the Philippines;

Fourth, Mr. BROWN of Colorado's amendment maintaining full accounting for POW/MIA's as the highest national priority;

Fifth, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey's provision condemning Chinese family planning policies;

Sixth, a provision based on the amendment offered by Mr. ROHRABACHER which earmarks $2 million for fiscal year 1990 for assistance to displaced Burmese students on the Thai-Burmese border;

Seventh, language proposed by Mr. PORTER clarifying that assistance available for Afghanistan may be used for bilateral and multilateral reconstructions efforts and for the establishment of a broad-based freely elected Afghan Government;

Eighth, a sense of Congress provision offered by Mr. DURBIN calling on India and Nepal to begin urgent negotiations to resolve their serious trade and transit dispute;

Ninth, language derived from provisions offered by Mr. BUECHNER and Mr. RITTER calling on the Soviet Union to facilitate the removal of mines from Afghanistan and to provide medical assistance to those injured by mines and urging increased United States assistance as necessary for the international mine clearing effort;

Tenth, a sense of Congress provision proposed by Mr. HERGER calling on India to end its support of the current government in Afghanistan and urging India to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and comply with international safeguard provisions;

Eleventh, a provision derived from the amendment offered by Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. RITTER stating United States support for a political settlement which provides for self-determination for the Afghan people and for the return of refugees and urging continued effective United States military assistance to the Afghan resistance;

I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. LEACH, as well as the authors of these various provisions, for their assistance in working out this en bloc amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate that I strongly support these en bloc amendments described by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong support for the en bloc amendments.

Mr. Chairman, as a founding member in 1977 and now as the chairman of the House POW/MIA Task Force, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Colorado expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to provide the highest national priority to achieving the fullest possible accounting of the 2,348 American servicemen still missing from the Vietnam war.

During his inauguration speech and at various times since then, President Bush has reaffirmed his commitment and priority to this important issue. Just last week at a Heritage Foundation conference Vice President QUAYLE reconfirmed this commitment. I believe it is very appropriate and important for Congress to do the same.

While it is true that following our withdrawal from Vietnam and throughout the 1970's, when we should have been doing the most about the POW/MIA issue, we were doing very little, that is emphatically not the case today. Since the beginning of the Reagan administration, the POW/MIA issue has received the full attention and priority it deserves. President Bush has continued with this responsible policy.

Although we have thus far been unable to prove with concrete, credible evidence that Americans are still detained against their will, the information available to us very much precludes ruling out that possibility. Actions to investigate live-sighting reports receive and will continue to receive the necessary priority and resources based on the assumption that at least some Americans are still held captive. Should any report prove true, we will take the action necessary to ensure the return of those involved.

The real obstacles to fullest possible accounting and the real answers to the numerous unresolved questions we still have about the fate of these Americans lie not in Washington, but in Hanoi. However, I believe further progress can be made so long as we provide the same solid determination and support we have already demonstrated.

I also support the amendment's provision calling for increased public awareness. A well-informed public armed with the facts is an important ally.

Mr. BROWN of California's amendment also reaffirms our support for current policy and law—which we enacted last year as part of the intelligence bill—providing primary next of kin with access to records concerning reported live sightings of Americans listed as MIA. The POW/MIA families have long suffered not knowing what happened to their loved one. We should continue to provide as much information as possible to them. We must continue to support these special families and remain steadfast with them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in strongly supporting the Brown amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my California colleague Mr. HERGER expressing Congress' serious concern about India's continued procurement of increasingly sophisticated Soviet weapons.

Quietly, but assuredly, India has significantly increased its military might over the past decade. Today, India is one of the most powerful countries militarily outside of the NATO-Warsaw Pact Community, with over 1 million men under arms. Much of the buildup, which I contend goes beyond adequate defensive needs, is based on the procurement of top-line Soviet equipment.

Over the past few years, India has procured from the Soviet Union.

A nuclear-powered submarine—the first time the Soviets have released a nuke to a navy other than its own!

Six Soviet Kilo attack submarines—the Soviets have provided this to no other navy.

Three Soviet Kaskin destroyers, with 3 more on order;

Three Soviet Nanuchka missile corvettes, with eight more of this or similar vessels on order

Bear TU-142 long-range patrol bombers

Over 200 MIG-23/27 fighter-bombers

One reconnaissance squadron of MIG-25's

Some 40 MIG-29's delivered or on order—this is the Soviet's new front-line fighter. India may license produce this jet.

Indian pilots have flown and evaluated the new MIG-35 and India will probably procure a substantial number of these aircraft.

Too little time to note the hundreds of tanks, missiles, other jet fighters, other aircraft and frigates India procured from the Soviets.

While India is quick to point out that it has reduced its military budget this year, we should be aware that it has risen in massive proportions in years previous. Within the past 5 years

Indian defense spending has risen 150 percent—approaching 20 percent of the Nation's total budget.

Yet, poverty, disease and hunger are still serious problems in India. I support development assistance to India to help alleviate the suffering and raise the standard of living for these poor. Yet, I must ask, is it fair to the American taxpayer to provide this help when the Indian Government is using its resources to buy Soviet weapons beyond what is needed for an adequate legitimate defense?

I am also very concerned about the prospects for a conventional arms race in the region stimulated by India's military buildup, especially when the development needs of India and its neighbors are so great. From my review of arms purchases in the region, I have found that India, more often than not, is responsible for continuing regional military competition.

Yes, India also procures weapons from the West. That is of great concern to me, too for similar reasons. Why does India, for example, need 2 aircraft carriers? However, I find it most disturbing for the world's largest democracy to closely cooperate militarily and provide financial payments to the world's greatest and most dangerous police state—the Soviet Union.

Indo-American relations have recently improved as marked by the signing of a new high-technology transfer agreement. However, there are still issues of serious concern to us like India's military buildup and weapons procurement policy. As our super 301 determinations address the trade concerns we have with India, I believe this sense of Congress amendment sends an appropriate and measured signal to India about some of our other serious concerns.

I urge my colleagues to support this Herger amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Mr. BUECHNER'S amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same. While many in the United States believe the war in Afghanistan is over, the fact is that the Afghan people continue to struggle to obtain their freedom. Even after the Soviet withdrawal, the Afghans are still being victimized, on a daily basis, by the Soviet Union, and its puppet, the Kabul regime. As this amendment so clearly points out, the Soviets continue to insist that Afghans die because of the countless mines the Red army left behind. Thousands of Afghans are unable to return to their homeland because of the mines which litter their country. Those who do are often killed or maimed by the mines.

Despite the assurances given to us by Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze that most of the mines exploded within days of being planted and the promises of Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gerasimov that the Soviet Union was not engaged in a mine war on the Afghan people, the fact is that the countryside of Afghanistan is still littered with mines. Furthermore, U.S. intelligence information reports that the Soviets planted more mines as they withdrew from the war-torn nation of Afghanistan. Moreover, the Soviets continue to refuse to provide the United Nations or the Afghans with maps of their mine fields so that the clean up can begin. This is not only tragic for the people of Afghanistan, but it is outrageous that the Soviet Government would refuse to provide even the most minimal assistance to this country which continues to suffer because of the cruelty of the self-proclaimed moderate Soviet "Peristroika" regime. This amendment calls on the Soviets to provide "generous support" to the efforts by the U.N. to facilitate the removal of the mines. I agree with the amendment that the U.S.S.R. should pay for the rebuilding of this ravaged nation. In light of the suffering of the Afghans, this is the very least the Soviets could do.

Mine warfare in Afghanistan is not the result of a well planned military tactic. These mines were scattered in militarily insignificant regions of the countryside of Afghanistan to wage war on civilians and to kill or maim anyone—even children—who would happen to be so unfortunate as to walk where the Soviets indiscriminately planted their terror. This amendment places the responsibility for the suffering children who no longer have arms and legs, and the dead parents who were obliterated by a mine where the blame properly lies, with the Soviet Union. The amendment expresses the belief of this Congress that the Soviets are responsible for cleaning up the fields of Afghanistan which they polluted with mines which kill and maim. The Soviets should stand responsible in every way for the desecration they continue to bring to the Afghan people. As this amendment stands, they should take every appropriate step to return the country they so tragically spoiled to a place where farmers can plow their fields to feed their families without fear of death or dismemberment, where children can walk in a field without fear of losing a limb, and where refugees can return without the horror of the explosion of a Soviet mine to welcome them.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to put the U.S. Congress on record as placing the blame for the tragedy of mine warfare in Afghanistan squarely where it belongs—on the Kremlin. Furthermore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to call on the Soviet Union, which has promised moderation and peacefulness, to take this opportunity to place actions with its words and to make right what they have so tragically done wrong—pay to clean up the mine fields its army laid in Afghanistan.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this en bloc amendment, and I congratulate those members, especially chairman FASCELL and Mr. BROOMFIELD, for their diligent work in putting this package together.

As we consider the entire issue of sanctions against China, we really are placed on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, all Members from both sides of the aisle are united expressing our indignation and revulsion at the brutality and repression in China. We have to make clear to the leaders of that government that China cannot be considered a member in good standing of the international community. We cannot have business as usual.

On the other hand, we don't want to do something that hurts the Chinese people. They do not like their government any more than we like it. We have to be careful to make sure that the Chinese people know we share their aspirations and we support them in their struggle.

This en bloc package strikes a balance, as much as is humanly possible, between these two concerns.

The bulk of the sanctions contained in this package are aimed at the high profile, prestige—making projects that are dear to the Chinese Government, but which have a less immediate impact on the lives of the Chinese people.

I believe that this en bloc amendment, coupled with the actions already announced by the administration, represents a reasonable and appropriate response to the appalling repression in China.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today I am offering an amendment to state unequivocally that the United States Congress deplores the continuing use of coercion in the People's Republic of China's [PRC] population control program. My amendment also calls on the President and the State Department to raise our concerns about this repressive policy with the Government of the PRC and it urges that Government to cease these practices immediately.

It should be abundantly clear to all that the People's Republic of China, through its one child per family

policy, continues to employ systematic coercion and brutality in achieving population control. The same iron fist that brought the prodemocracy students to their knees in Tiananmen Square has, since 1979, been using forced abortion, coercive sterilization, and mandatory IUD insertion to control the masses. The simple fact of the matter is the people of China have no rights whatsoever concerning family planning matters.

The result of this cruel and inhumane assault on the family has been approximately 110 million children aborted since 1979—a number equal to the combined population of England and France—and most through coercion. The result has been millions of women and men sterilized under Government duress, compulsion or threat of punishment and still millions more women who have undergone mandatory IUD insertions.

In this exhaustive 1988 study on population trends in China, Judith Banister and Karen Hardee-Cleveland of the U.S. Bureau of the Census conclude: "Today, Chinese couples still are not given a choice about whether they practice family planning, how many children they have, when they have the allowed birth or births, whether or not to sign family planning contracts, or what form of birth control they will use."

And let's not kid ourselves that things are easing up in China as some apologists contend. The evidence suggests coercion is actually on the rise. Of course, the Communists in Beijing deny all of this. Just as they denied the massacre in Tiananmen Square and the killings and purges in Tibet. The big lie repeated often enough persuades the gullible and provides plausible cover for the apologist. We should not be fooled, however, nor can we be an accessory to these crimes.

The evidence is overwhelming that the Chinese Government is continuing to use forced abortion and other coercive measures to implement their restrictive "one child per couple" policy. On June 7, the United States Agency for International Development once again determined that the PRC's ongoing use of coercion rendered the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] ineligible for United States assistance. The UNFPA is heavily involved in supporting China's population program. AID has made such a determination every year now since 1985.

In a March 29, 1985 report to AID Administrator M. Peter McPherson, Assistant Administrator Richard Derham wrote:

Based on the evidence available * * * there is "probable cause" to believe that coercion, sponsored by the Government, is prevalent in the PRC's family planning program * * * I further conclude that the UNFPA program cannot be disentangled from the pervasive coercion of the system and that even if it could, the shadow on the PRC program would pose difficulties. Hence, I conclude that the U.S. should take strong action to dissociate itself from the China program.—("Information Memorandum for the Administrator," March 29, 1985.)

On August 28, 1986, Administrator McPherson announced his determination that the UNFPA's involvement in China was in violation of the Kemp-Kasten amendment. This legislation states that no U.S. population assistance funds can be made available to any organization or program which supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

On August 13, 1987, AID officially declared that there had been no significant changes in the China/UNFPA Program to change the adverse judgments reached in 1985 and 1986. AID Assistant Administrator Richard E. Bissell said in an August 10, 1987, memo to Acting Administrator Jay Morris:

The Chinese program remains systematically coercive . . . Chinese spokesmen at recent family planning conferences have stated that *births not covered by the plan must be strictly banned* and *prescribed penalties should be applied firmly and promptly until pregnancies outside the plan are terminated* * * * There is *no basis for changing the program* * * * Official statements clearly say that abortion and/or sterilization not freely chosen by couples is a publicly approved remedy for births outside the state plan. [All italic in the original.]

Mr. Bissell attached a memo titled, "Coercion in the Chinese Family Planning Program: June 1987 Update," which stated that AID's findings—

* * * were derived from review of FBIS [Foreign Broadcast Information Service] reports and from a large number of cables, reports, memoranda, and other documents provided by the China desk, covering the period November 1986 through May 1987. This report avoids the citation of sources in most cases in order to protect sensitive materials. Additional information describing severe penalties is not included in this report because the sources are classified. China experts Judith Banister (Bureau of the Census) and Susan Greenhalgh (Population Council) informally reviewed the information and conclusions presented above and independently verified the accuracy of the information and conclusions in the report.

On May 27, 1988, AID Administrator Alan Woods announced that the boycott of UNFPA would be continued for fiscal year 1988, because a review of the China/UNFPA Program, conducted by the United States Census Bureau's Center for International Research, indicate that "significant changes that would warrant resumption of support have not occurred."

Mr. Chairman, in at least four cases within the past year, PRC nationals have been granted political asylum in the United States after they or their spouses were placed under duress to submit to abortions. The February 5, 1989, edition of the Washington Post reported on a decision by U.S. Immigration Judge Bernard J. Hornbach to grant political asylum to Yun Pan Lee. The Post reported that Lee was granted political asylum because "he would be persecuted by China's strict population-control policies if he were forced to return home."

On April 10, 1988, the Washington Post published an exposé by anthropologist Steven Mosher which revealed the length to which some Chinese Government officials will go to enforce the birth quota policy. Ping Hong, a Chinese woman who joined her husband in Phoenix 3 years ago, became pregnant with her second child in May 1987. She was warned to obtain an abortion in the United States immediately or return to China without delay to undergo an abortion.

When Ping Hong failed to respond to the abortion directive, she received a very blunt letter from the population control office at her place of employment in China. The letter read as follows:

COMRADE PING HONG: Have you received our last express mail letter? Have you taken any action as a result?

The factory officials are anxious to know whether or not you have done as ordered, since your actions affect the benefits of all employees in the factory as well as the factory's future. The punishment for this kind of violation (having a second child) is very severe.

If you cannot have this abortion done abroad, then the factory director orders you to return to China immediately. Any further delays, and you will be punished according to the law.

There is nothing ambiguous about our order! Make up your mind immediately!

To your health.

Mr. Chairman, about 2 months ago I had the privilege of meeting Ping Hong and her young daughter. Fortunately, this was one case where a determined woman was able to evade the long arm of the totalitarian Chinese regime. Tragically, millions of others are unable to withstand the brutal tactics that are employed to enforce their compliance with a repressive and immoral policy.

The January 27, 1989, edition, of the Washington China Post carried a very disturbing report by Ge Hua, a mainland scholar. This article has been cited in a February 8, 1989, report by Tao-tai Hsia, chief of the Far Eastern Law Division of the Library of Congress. The author of the Washington China Post article says that "Killing live babies and wanton use of fetal organs for laboratory research are prevalent on the mainland." He states that in China, "all second pregnancies or above are considered as illegal and excessive pregnancies. They must be aborted." Pointing to the prevalence of late-term or full-term abortions, he writes that "many gynecologists and nurses on the mainland are forced to

kill the babies against their conscience. Sometimes they have to kill several tens of them in a day," he reports.

At the 1984 International Conference on Population, the U.S. Government stated that: "Attempts to use abortion, involuntary sterilization, or other coercive measures in family planning must be shunned, whether exercised against families within a society or against nations within the family of man." It is also important to remember that at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, forced abortion was regarded as a "crime against humanity."

Mr. Chairman, today the U.S. Congress has the opportunity to state unequivocally that forced abortion is indeed a "crime against humanity." We should make it clear that we strongly condemn the continued violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

History will not be kind to those who, in the midst of evil, stood by silently. Lincoln once said: "to sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men." The women of China and their babies desperately need our support. By adopting this amendment, we are making it clear that respect for fundamental human rights is an important element of international relations. If the Chinese Government wants to earn the respect of the American people, they can begin by demonstrating respect for the rights of their own people. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my Republican leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I congratulate him for all his good work. I also want to thank my former chairman for 6 of the best years I have spent in this House under his helmsmanship as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Some of the best work in this House on Foreign Affairs goes into these noncontroversial amendments that are accepted rashly by both sides and introduced en bloc, and very little time is spent speaking on them.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is so important. All of these amendments on both sides of the aisle are important. Two of mine were accepted, and I want to spend about 10 seconds on each.

There is a new section to require annual certification of Communist China's arms transfers—they are not only sales—to Iran and Iraq. They have killed one another for almost a decade. Libya, one of the leading terrorist nations, and Syria, which has done more evil work in terrorism than probably even Colonel Qadhafi's Libya, are the subject of these amendments. That certification is going to be very important to free people around the world.

My second amendment links United States technology transfers to communism, to their lethal aid to the Khmer Rhouge, the perpetrators of a genocide of 2 to 3 million people.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for accepting them, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his good work.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has already relinquished his time.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the chair for a second. At the time I yielded back my time, I did not realize there were other speakers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may reinstate his time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

Before engaging in this colloquy, let me mention that the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] and I have noticed an amendment on Cambodia that we had intended to introduce before making a final decision about whether to go ahead with that amendment on Cambodia.

□ 1120

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] if he could explain to me and to the other Members of the body procedurally the context of his language in the legislation as it now stands in the following respect:

Is there a dollar limit on the amount of money that can be authorized pursuant to this legislation to the noncommunist resistance in Cambodia, and what will the procedural framework be for the administration, if it wanted to exceed any particular limit or any particular level?

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] for his inquiry, and I thank him even more for the interest which he has shown in the fate and future of the Cambodian people.

The answer to the question of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] is that there is no precise limitation in the legislation, but there is a precise limitation in the law.

We have authorized in this legislation aid to the non-Communist resistance forces in response to an administration request in the congressional presentation document which indicated that the administration wanted to provide the non-Communist resistance forces with $7 million for the next fiscal year.

Under the well-established procedures by which funds are provided in the foreign aid bill to countries, or organizations, or programs or movements requested by the administration, if the administration should decide that it wants to spend a single cent above and beyond the $7 million it has requested for the non-Communist resistance forces within the framework of the Foreign Assistance Act, it would be obligated to notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of its desire to reprogram moneys from other programs for the purpose of providing those additional funds to the NCR, and at that point, under well-established procedures written into law which have always been faithfully respected by the administration, the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations would both have to affirmatively approve this request for any increase whatsoever in funding above the $7 million which has been requested.

As a consequence, Mr. Chairman, I can safely, and fairly and reliably report to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] and to the other Members of the House that this is not an open-ended authorization. This administration is not free to spend unlimited amounts of money on this program. It would have to notify the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if it wanted to spend anything above the $7 million requested, and, if either committee objected to it, either committee, not the House as a whole, but either committee objected to it, then it could not go forward, and of course, if both committees approved, but, if the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] or anybody else felt it should not go forward, legislation could be introduced, and it could be prevented.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] for those assurances which are very important as an assurance to summarize

and restate that, if a penny more than the $7 million is spent, either the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or the Committee on Appropriations or the House could ensure that that additional money is not spent.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] just yield on that point?

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to give the Members one other assurance, that if and when such a notification is received, and it may not be, I want to assure the Members that this will not be quietly approved in the still of the night without other Members knowing about it. I guarantee the Members that they will be notified. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] will be notified, every other Member who has expressed an interest, and we will have a hearing on it in order to obligate them to justify any such requests, if it should be forthcoming.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, these assurances are very helpful. Obviously the goal of all of us is to ensure that there be a non-Communist regime in Cambodia and that it not include the Khmer Rouge, and the reason that the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] and I have intended to offer the amendment that we have before us today is because of our deep concern about this issue which we know is shared by the chairman of the subcommittee and the full committee that the United States do nothing inadvertently or not inadvertently to enhance the ability of the Khmer Rouge, that brutal, outrageous group of thugs, to return to power in Cambodia.

However, based on the assurances I have received today from the gentleman from New York, I will not offer my amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining on this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FASCELL] has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield that time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], and I would like to engage my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] in a colloquy here.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] for his reassurances which have been given to us on this floor which make me feel a lot better. I do not just speak for myself, nor does the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], in our concern.

Mr. Chairman, within about 15 minutes we had about 25 signatures on our dear colleague on this particular issue. I think the gentleman is aware of that.

Many of us came to this body, having lived through years when we got involved in Southeast Asia in a way that no one really ever debated, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] and I want to make sure that these issues get debated, and, frankly, to have 2 minutes to discuss it is unfortunate, but I am delighted even to have that much opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, our concern revolved around two things, the blank check, of which we were informed of today, certainly will not apply if the administration wishes to go beyond $7 million, and we will be watching that.

Second, our fear is that some of this aid could go to the very people who were probably the worst murderers in recent years, the Khmer Rouge, and I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] on that point what assurances he can make to us that none of the $7 million could wind up in the hands of the Khmer Rouge.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, this is a very good question. I share the concerns of the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] entirely.

The response is that there is explicit language in the bill which prohibits any of our assistance, directly or indirectly, from going to the Khmer Rouge. We have assurances from the leadership of the NCR. They will do everything to make sure it does not happen. The administration plans to establish and implement procedures to make sure it does not happen. It has not happened for 10 years, but——

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute, 30 seconds, if I might.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has no time remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I asked unanimous consent for 30 seconds, if I might.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object because I made that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] will stay right there until I get the next amendment up, I will try to give her the additional time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to regain the 3 minutes I yielded back, and I have a request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] reserved the 3 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for a second?

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has no further requests for time, would he be kind enough to let the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] complete her statement?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 of my 3 remaining minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] kindly.

Let me make the point to my colleagues, and then I will yield back whatever I have left, that we have seen photographs, we have seen photographs of Prince Sihanouk standing side by side with the leader of the Khmer Rouge, and that gives this gentlewoman, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] and many Members in this House pause. We are concerned. They are a part of one coalition, and I would say to the gentleman that this is not going to be the end of this issue, as he knows. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] and I may very well introduce a separate bill stating that, until such time as Prince Sihanouk and his faction breaks off with the Khmer Rouge, no lethal aid should go to Prince Sihanouk, and I just want to put this House on notice that we will not be going away.

□ 1130

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BUECHNER].

Mr. BUECHNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment within the en bloc amendment expressing the sense of the Congress on the subject of the removal of millions of deadly unexploded mines which remain in Afghanistan. Although the tragedy of the war in Afghanistan no longer commands headlines it is far from over. Nor will it be even after the last shot fired and the last battle is fought. Scattered across the rugged Afghanistan countryside millions of unexploded mines continue to exact a toll in human pain and suffering. An estimated 30 million mines were deployed during this conflict—enough to kill every man, woman, and child 3 or 4 times over.

One must question the motivations of those who planted these mines. The Soviet Union has portrayed them as a consequence of the struggle against armed insurrection, a legitimate action in a conflict against insurgency. However, this is hardly the case. Rather it

is an example of terroristic tactics used by a nation intent on subjugating the Afghan people by means of war against innocents. Focusing the brunt of the attack not on legitimate combatants, they instead unleased their policies of terror on the children of Afghanistan. And make no mistake about it, a large portion of these mines were in fact directed at children as evidenced by their having been manufactured to look like toys—toys from the devils' playground designed to maim or kill innocent kids. With the estimated 4 million refugees already returning home, the problem will only get worse. The United Nations is assisting this effort but much remains to be done—and I believe my amendment is a good place to start.

My amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that the Soviet Union should accept its humanitarian responsibilities to the people of Afghanistan and immediately provide the aid and assistance necessary to help alleviate this serious problem. Absent this assistance the United Nations should continue its mine removal efforts and then take steps to recover the costs from the Soviet Union. Its intent is relatively straightforward, in effect saying, "You created this mess, you clean it up."

Please join me in supporting this amendment with the hope that pressure from the United States Congress will be instrumental in ending this nightmare for the Afghan people.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more noble than America's commitment to helping brave people who are fighting for their freedom in desperate circumstances. This piece of legislation contains 2 million dollars' worth of humanitarian aid for young people who were students in Burma a year ago who rose up against the dictatorship in Rangoon and who just in very similar circumstances to what happened to the students in China faced tyranny and faced oppression and are now offering a democratic resistance. We can be very proud that we are helping these students with humanitarian aid.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Levine-Boxer amendment on Cambodia, proposed to be offered. None of us want to see the Khmer Rouge come to power nor do we want any American aid to fall into the Khmer Rouge's hands. To claim otherwise is absolutely false. Furthermore, the provisions in H.R. 2655, as currently written, will help prevent the Khmer Rouge from returning to power much better than the Levine-Boxer amendment. In fact, the Levine-Boxer amendment will weaken the non-Communist resistance thereby increasing the power and capabilities of the Khmer Rouge.

The bill, as written: First, continues the President's authority to provide lethal and nonlethal assistance to the non-Communist resistance; second, grants the President the authority to furnish funds to provide nonmilitary training for Cambodians who might return to their country after a political settlement; third, grants the President the authority to provide assistance for the relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of Cambodia in the context of an internationally acceptable political settlement; and fourth, reinstates the statutory prohibition against United States assistance for the purpose or with the effect of promoting, sustaining, or augmenting, directly or indirectly, the capacity of the Khmer Rouge of any of its members to conduct military or paramilitary operations. Clearly, this language prevents assistance that directly or indirectly helps the Khmer Rouge—contrary to misleading Dear Colleagues on the issue that have been circulated.

The bill as written does not provide lethal assistance to the non-Communist resistance. Supporters of the Levine-Boxer amendment are trying to make it appear that the bill does. The bill does provide the President with the option of providing such assistance. This is a responsible measure because it gives the administration the flexibility it needs to best meet the challenges presented by the Cambodian situation. For example, this option will give the non-Communist resistance additional leverage in negotiations on the future of Cambodia. Why unnecessarily take away an option like this one? To rule out the possibility of lethal assistance, we are signalling to the non-Communist resistance, the Khmer Rouge, and the Vietnamese that we really don't care about the fate of Cambodia.

While the non-Communist resistance is part of the coalition government which includes the Khmer Rouge, those with even a minimum knowledge of the situation know that this is a coalition on paper only created for the purposes of international public diplomacy and occupying a U.N. seat. And, the bill as written, does reiterate the current statutory prohibition against assistance that would benefit the Khmer Rouge.

The Khmer Rouge and its genocidal policies are a serious threat to the future of Cambodia. I believe that if the Khmer Rouge were to return to power, we would witness another barbaric killing fields. There is an alternative to the Khmer Rouge—the non-Communist resistance [NCR]. However, today the Khmer Rouge is significantly stronger than the NCR. Because the Vietnamese appear to be withdrawing, without additional support, the NCR will be unable to block a Khmer Rouge takeover. Is this what the Levine-Boxer amendment is meant to do?

It is significant to recognize that the current Cambodia provisions are the result of the hard work of our colleague, the chairman of the Asia-Pacific subcommittee, STEVE SOLARZ. Chairman SOLARZ is our resident-expert on Cambodia. I know, as a member of his subcommittee, that he would never approve of any provisions that could, in even the most remote way, benefit the Khmer Rouge. Yet, understanding the realities of the situation, Chairman SOLARZ recognizes that the option for lethal assistance must be left open if we are to really help bring democracy to Cambodia and keep the Khmer Rouge out of power. The administration also strongly supports the Cambodia language as written—it has wide bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, 20 years ago some of the same attitudes on providing lethal assistance to non-Communist forces in Cambodia prevailed. The same demand that we severely limit our options in light of progress being made toward a political settlement in Cambodia was raised. The result? A Khmer Rouge dictatorship and the butchering of millions of innocent Cambodians. We should learn from history and leave every option open. We must not allow the Khmer Rouge to rule again.

Again, the bill as written does not provide lethal aid, it provides the President with the option of providing it. He does not have to use that option. But, having the option is an important negotiating tool itself. The Levine-Boxer amendment would eliminate that option and that negotiating tool. That hurts and weakens the NCR and strengthens the Khmer Rouge.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Levine-Boxer amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clarifies existing law and the authority of the President to expend funds already authorized to be appropriated toward the development and implementation of long-range bilateral and multilateral reconstruction efforts for Afghanistan and the establishment of a broad-based freely elected Afghan government.

Withdrawn Soviet troops left behind a country ravaged by 9 years of bloody and destructive war. The Kremlin's military strategy of bombing villages and burning farms has changed the face of Afghanistan's landscape.

Today, 50 percent of all farm and most of the critical irrigation system has been destroyed. Of the 22,000 villages existing in 1979, only 5,000 remain unscathed. In addition, Afghanistan faces the repatriation of close to half its prewar population, 7 million people, requiring extensive health and education efforts to prevent disease and starvation upon their return.

However, none of the refugees will return to their homes as long as the fighting continues inside Afghanistan. Only when the guns fall silent and the landmines are found and removed, and when there is a freely established, broad-based democratic government will these tragically displaced people go home.

And when that happens, Mr. Chairman, the United States, together with the rest of the developed world, must be ready to assist the Government and people of Afghanistan with the enormous task of putting their country and lives back together. United States military and humanitarian assistance to the Afghan freedom fighters helped pave the way for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. The development of a long-range bilateral and multilateral reconstruction plan will reassert the United States' dedication to the integrity of a free Afghanistan and the well-being of its people.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise on behalf of my amendment, now included in the en bloc amendment to title IX, regarding the current dispute between India and Nepal.

It has been nearly 3 months since treaties governing trade and transit between India and Nepal expired, and India closed 19 of 21 border crossings into Nepal, contributing to a disruption of trade between the two countries.

This virtual economic blockade has had a devastating impact of the tiny nation of Nepal. Since Nepal is a landlocked country that depends on India for 33 percent of her trade, the blockade has created widespread shortages of critical items such as fuel and medicine. News accounts have reported diabetes patients unable to obtain insulin. Residents of Kathmandu are limiting themselves to one meal a day to conserve fuel, and many cannot purchase basic commodities such as salt and sugar. Schools and factories have been forced to close, and electricity is being rationed.

The long-term damage to Nepal will be even worse. The Nepalese government now predicts that economic growth will drop from 5 to 1.5 percent for this year, and that inflation will rise from 8 to 20 percent. Development projects run by the World Bank, USAID, and private voluntary organizations such as CARE and Save the Children have been curtailed. Most disturbing of all is the rapid acceleration of deforestation as the Nepalese substitute wood fuel for kerosene—five times as much wood is being cut now as before the blockade.

The United States has a strong interest in seeing this situation reversed. We have 138 Peace Corps volunteers in Nepal whose well-being has been put at risk by the growing shortages and difficulties in transportation. The $12 million we will invest in development in Nepal this year is being wasted, as our projects grind to a health because of the lack of fuel and supplies.

Several colleagues and I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 115, which calls on India to end its economic blockade of Nepal and instead sit down to negotiate with Nepal. This resolution has attracted a bipartisan group of 60 cosponsors, and some of its language was incorporated in the bill we are now considering.

In part because of these efforts, India appears to have responded to Nepal's offer to negotiate. This report, if true, is welcome progress and hopefully will lead to a quick resolution of the differences between India and Nepal.

It is important, however, for the Congress to express its continuing concern over the situation in Nepal. My amendment updates and strengthens the language already adopted by the Foreign Affairs Committee. Specifically, my amendment urges India and Nepal to schedule without delay the time and place for talks to begin between the two governments. It also asks India, as a gesture of good will befitting a responsible regional power, to resume the sale of petroleum products to Nepal and encourage the normal passage of people and goods into and out of Nepal.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to speak out on behalf of the Nepalese people, whose very future is at stake. I hope my fellow colleagues will vote for the en bloc amendment as a way of showing support for Nepal in this difficult time.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, many of my colleagues may be aware that this month marks the 40th anniversary of the Allied airlift to Berlin. The Berlin airlift was an airlift to life—of food and provisions. But, at this very moment—in Kabul, Afghanistan—an equally massive Soviet airlift is occurring—an airlift of death, where 10,000 tons— weekly—of guns, mines, tanks, artillery, and armored personnel carriers dwarf the meager amount of food and supplies being sent.

Mr. Chairman, I think that most of my colleagues remember the recent visit by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan to our Chamber here. I hope that my colleagues will recall and realize that the fledgling democracy, that Benazir Bhutto has thus far been able to foster, is strained by the millions of Afghan refugees that have not been able to return to their homeland.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support Prime Minister Bhutto and the people of Pakistan and Afghanistan by supporting these amendments which my colleagues and I have worked together to offer on the Afghanistan situation.

Among other things these amendments would urge effective American support for the Afghan resistance in order to enable them to curtail the massive Soviet airlift of military equipment to the Kabul puppet regime. Further these amendments address the problem of the 30 million mines in Afghanistan by urging the Soviet Union to provide maps of the mine fields and support the U.N. mine clearing effort. In consistence with U.S. humanitarian efforts, it further urges the President of the United States to provide assistance, as he deems necessary, for the purpose of clearing mines in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, these amendments are directly related to our foreign aid goals for the Afghan people. The millions of Soviet mines in Afghanistan and the massive Soviet airlift of military equipment will continue to render United States foreign assistance objectives to the Afghan people ineffective. These Soviet weapons and mines are paralyzing the return of the Afghan people to their homes, and rendering useless the agriculturally based economy of Afghanistan. The effect of assisting the Afghan people in stopping this airlift and in clearing up the mines in Afghanistan will be to expedite a peaceful, political settlement in Afghanistan, and to provide a safety valve to help relieve the great internal pressure the Afghan refugees are placing on Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, the present regime in Afghanistan is not supported by the Afghan people. Najibullah, as chief of the secret police and as leader of the Afghan puppet-regime, is supported by a massive Soviet military and economic umbilical cord that allows him to impose his power on the Afghan people.

The United States should continue to encourage a political settlement that will bring an end to the fighting in Afghanistan, but the government of the Najibullah regime is an illegal construct that the majority of the Afghan people fear and detest.

Mr. Chairman, I think its important that we realize that although the Afghan people have defended their own country and freedoms, in many ways it can be said that they fought for America—denying a domination or cutoff of the vital oil routes of this volatile region.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the people of Afghanistan and Pakistan by voting for these important amendments.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendments which our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, is proposing for inclusion in the foreign assistance legislation. One of the amendments which he proposes to include in this bill is an amendment that I introduced with our distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan. Our amendment expresses the concern of the Congress regarding human rights violations against ethnic Albanians in Yugoslavia, and it is essentially the same language as House Concurent Resolution 152, which I introduced with Mr. BROOMFIELD.

It is highly significant that we are considering this legislaiton today—on June 28. According to estimates of Yugoslav news agencies, today more than 1 million Serbs will converge in the Yugoslav autonomous Province of Kosovo to commemorate the 600th anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo Polje of 1389, in which the Ottoman Turks sealed their rule over the Balkans.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that on this occasion, which has generated an outpouring of Serbian nationalism, that we remember the rights of ethnic Albanians, who constitute the vast majority of the population of the Province of Kosovo. Our amendment deals with the serious problems that have been taking place in Kosovo in recent months.

The Department of State's 1988 Country Report on Human Rights Practices cites many human rights practices in Yugoslavia that violate internationally accepted human rights standards, including infringement upon and abrogation of the rights of assembly and fair trial, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. The report indicates that these human rights violations tend to be targeted against certain ethnic groups and regions, most particularly against the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.

Mr. Chairman, those human rights violations, in addition to recent Yugoslav Government actions to limit the social and political autonomy of the Province of Kosovo, precipitated a crisis in that region which resulted in a brutal police crackdown that led to the deaths of many civilians and police officers, the wounding of hundreds more, and the imprisonment of many others. These tragic events in Kosovo violate the high ideals of mutual equality, dignity, and brotherhood among Yugoslavia's nationalities which have been a guiding principle of Yugoslavia since 1945.

It is important that we in the Congress express our very serious concern regarding the actions of the Yugoslav Government for these repeated human rights violations and the brutal handling of the crisis in Kosovo. Yugoslavia should take steps to assure that further violence and bloodshed do not occur in Kosovo and that the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act be observed to assure full protection of the rights of the Albanian ethnic minority in Yugoslavia.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we in the Congress speak out on these important human rights issues. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the inclusion of this amendment in the legislation we are now considering.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and myself, I offer en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

En bloc amendments offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 526, add the following after line 24:

SEC. 910. PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) on June 4, 1989, the Government of the People's Republic of China ordered unprovoked, brutal, and indiscriminate assault on thousands of peaceful and unarmed demonstrators and onlookers in and around Tiananmen Square by units of the People's Liberation Army, which resulted in at least 700 deaths and massive injuries;

(2) the Chinese Government has executed at least 27 individuals who participated in prodemocracy demonstrations or who protested the brutal military assault against peaceful demonstrators;

(3) the Government of the People's Republic of China is engaging in widespread mass arrests in the aftermath of the June 4, 1989, military assault in Tiananmen Square, which have resulted in the arrests of thousands of students, workers, and other civilians so far;

(4) independent international human rights organizations, such as Amnesty International and Asia Watch, have documented daily incidences of arbitrary arrests, torture, and beating by police and military forces in the People's Republic of China;

(5) the Chinese Government has established telephone hotlines and other local communications networks for the express purpose of identifying and imprisoning prodemocracy supporters and political dissidents throughout the country;

(6) officials of the Chinese Government have grossly distorted the government's actions to suppress the prodemocracy movement, including by clandestinely disposing of the bodies of demonstrators without informing their families, and have consistently denied that the massacre in and around Tiananmen Square took place or that abuses of human rights have occurred;

(7) in an effort to conceal the truth about the Chinese Government's brutal suppression of the prodemocracy movement, foreign journalists have been expelled and Voice of America broadcasts are being jammed;

(8) in view of the widespread and continuing repression, noted Chinese intellectuals and advocates of peaceful democratic reform, Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian, sought refuge at the United States Embassy in Beijing on June 3, 1989, and the United States exercised its prerogatives under long-standing practices of diplomatic missions by granting them refuge; and

(9) the President has condemned the actions of the leaders of the People's Republic of China against participants in the prodemocracy movement in China and has taken several concrete steps to respond to the repression of the movement, including—

(A) suspending all exports of items on the United States Munitions List, including arms and defense related equipment, to the People's Republic of China;

(B) suspending high level government-to-government contract between the United States and the People's Republic of China;

(C) extending the visas of nationals of the People's Republic of China currently in the United States;

(D) offering humanitarian and medical assistance to the injured through the Red Cross;

(E) instructing United States representatives to international financial institutions to seek delay in the consideration of loan requests that are made to those financial institutions and would benefit the People's Republic of China.

(F) suspending action on applications for the issuance by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation of new insurance and financing of investments in the People's Republic of China by United States investors;

(G) opposing the further liberalization of the guidelines of the group known as the Coordinating Committee regarding trade with the People's Republic of China;

(H) taking no further action to implement the agreement for cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China relating to the uses of nuclear energy, thereby foreclosing the issuance of new licenses; and

(I) suspending the license for the export of any United States manufactured satellites for launch on launch vehicles owned by the People's Republic of China, including the two Aussat satellites and the Asiasat satellite.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President is to be commended for his clear articulation of United States condemnation of the actions of the Government of the People's Republic of China in the killing and persecution of the participants of the prodemocracy movement in the People's Republic of China, and for the responses and measures by the President against the People's Republic of China, which the Congress supports;

(2) the consultative approach that the President has used in coordinating with other countries the United States response to the atrocities committed by the leaders of the People's Republic of China should be supported;

(3) it is essential for the United States to speak in a bipartisan and unified voice in response to the events in the People's Republic of China, and that the President be given the necessary flexibility to respond to rapidly changing situations so that the long-term interests of the United States are not damaged;

(4) in this vein, the President should continue to emphasize to the leaders of the Government of the People's Republic of China that resumption of normal diplomatic and military relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China will depend directly on the Chinese Government's halting of executions of prodemocracy movement supporters, releasing those imprisoned for their political beliefs, and increasing respect for internationally recognized human rights;

(5) because human rights violations in a country as populous as the People's Republic of China may have serious implications for the stability of the Asia-Pacific region, the United Nations should, in order to further regional security and peace, condemn the violent repression, mass arrests, and executions of peaceful demonstrators by the Government of the People's Republic of China and urge the Chinese Government to enter into negotiations with representatives of the prodemocracy movement;

(6) United States policy toward the People's Republic of China should be explicitly linked with the situation in Tibet as well as elsewhere in that country, specifically as to whether—

(A) martial law is lifted in Lhasa and other parts of Tibet;

(B) Tibet is open to foreigners, including representatives of the international press and of international human rights organizations;

(c) Tibetan political prisoners are released; and

(D) the Government of the People's Republic of China is entering into negotiations with representatives of the Dalai Lama on a settlement of the Tibetan question;

(7) the guarantee of the People's Republic of China for "one country, two systems" in Hong Kong has little credibility in light of the ongoing brutal crackdown on prodemocratic forces in the People's Republic of China, and the President and the Secretary of State should convey to the People's Republic of China and the United Kingdom the strong reservations of the United States with respect to the absence of guarantees of free direct elections and human rights in the bilateral agreement which provides for the reversion of the administration of Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China in 1997;

(8) the United States should offer admission to the United States to any national of the People's Republic of China who is under threat of severe penalty as a result of participating in prodemocracy demonstrations; and

(9) the President should be commended for his courageous and appropriate action, in accordance with the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Practices and customary international law, in swiftly providing temporary refuge to Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian at the United States Embassy in Beijing, and the President should continue to provide refuge to those individuals to ensure their personal safety.

(c) SUSPENSIONS.—

(1) OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.—The Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall continue to suspend the issuance of any new insurance, reinsurance, guarantees, financing, or other financial support with respect to the People's Republic of China, unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(2) TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The President shall suspend the use of any funds made available to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for activities of the Trade and Development Agency with respect to the People's Republic of China, unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(3) MUNITIONS EXPORT LICENSES.—The issuance of licenses under section 38 of the Defense Trade and Export Control Act for the export to the People's Republic of China of any defense article on the United

States Munitions List, including helicopters and helicopter parts, shall, subject to subsection (e), continue to be suspended unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(4) CRIME CONTROL AND DETECTION INSTRUMENTS AND EQUIPMENT.—The issuance of any license under section 6(k) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for the export to the People's Republic of China of any crime control or detection instruments or equipment shall be suspended, unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(5) EXPORT OF SATELLITES FOR LAUNCH BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—Any license for the export of a satellite of United States origin that is intended for launch from a launch vehicle owned by the People's Republic of China (specifically including the Hughes Aircraft Model HS-601 Spacecraft (commercial communications satellites) whose export is described in the certification transmitted to the Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act of September 12, 1988) shall continue to be suspended unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section. Any license for such an export that was issued before the enactment of this Act shall also continue to be suspended unless the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(6) NUCLEAR COOPERATION WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.—(A) Any—

(i) application for a license under the Export Administration Act of 1979 for the export to the People's Republic of China for use in a nuclear production or utilization facility of any goods or technology which, as determined under section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, could be of significance for nuclear explosive purposes, or which, in the judgment of the President, is likely to be diverted for use in such a facility, for any nuclear explosive device, or for research on or development of any nuclear explosive device, shall be suspended,

(ii) application for a license for the export to the People's Republic of China of any nuclear material, facilities, or components subject to the Agreement shall be suspended,

(iii) approval for the transfer or retransfer to the People's Republic of China of any nuclear material, facilities, or components subject to the Agreement shall not be given, and

(iv) specific authorization for assistance in any activities with respect to the People's Republic of China relating to the use of nuclear energy under section 57 b.(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 shall not be given,

until—

(I) the President has certified to the Congress that the People's Republic of China has provided clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any non-nuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the materials and components for such devices;

(II) the President has made the certifications and submitted the report required by Public Law 99-183; and

(III) the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section.

(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term "Agreement" means the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the People's Republic of China Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, done on June 23, 1985.

(7) LIBERALIZATION OF EXPORT CONTROLS.—The President shall negotiate with the governments participating in the group known as the Coordinating Committee to suspend, on a multilateral basis, any liberalization by the Coordinating Committee of controls on exports of goods and technology to the People's Republic of China under section 5 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, including—

(A) the implementation of bulk licenses for exports to the People's Republic of China; and

(B) the raising of the performance levels of goods or technology below which no authority or permission to export to the People's Republic of China would be required.

The President shall oppose any liberalization by the Coordinating Committee of controls which are described in subparagraph (B), until the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, or until the President makes a report under subsection (d) of this section, whichever occurs first.

(d) TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS.—A report referred to in subsection (c) is a report by the President to the Congress—

(1) that the Government of the People's Republic of China has made progress on a program of political reform throughout the country, including Tibet, which includes—

(A) lifting of martial law;

(B) halting of executions and other reprisals against individuals for the nonviolent expression of their political beliefs;

(C) release of political prisoners;

(D) increased respect for internationally recognized human rights, including freedom of expression, the press, assembly, and association; and

(E) permitting a freer flow of information, including an end to the jamming of Voice of America and greater access for foreign journalists; or

(2) that it is in the national security interest of the United States to terminate a suspension under paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5), to terminate a suspension or disapproval under paragraph (6), or to terminate the opposition required by paragraph (7), as the case may be.

(e) APPLICABILITY OF SUBSECTION (c)(3).—The suspension set forth in subsection (c)(3) shall not apply to systems and components designed specifically for inclusion in civil products and controlled as defense articles only for purposes of export to a controlled country, unless the President determines that the intended recipient of such items is the military or security forces of the People's Republic of China.

(f) TASK FORCE ON STUDENTS FROM THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a task force to be known as the Task Force on Certain Nationals of the People's Republic of China in the United States (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Task Force"). The Task Force shall be composed of the Secretary of State (or his designee), who shall be the chair of the Task Force, and representatives of other relevant agencies, as determined by the Secretary of State.

(2) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Task Force shall carry out the following duties and responsibilities:

(A) Taking into consideration the situation in the People's Republic of China, the Task Force shall assess the specific needs and status of citizens of the People's Republic of China who were admitted under nonimmigrant visas to the United States.

(B) The Task Force shall formulate and recommend to the Congress and the President policies and programs to address the needs determined under subparagraph (A).

(C) The Task Force shall establish, directly or indirectly, a clearinghouse to provide those Chinese citizens described in subparagraph (A) and United States institutions of higher education with appropriate information, including—

(i) public and private sources of financial assistance available to such citizens;

(ii) information and assistance regarding visas and immigration status; and

(iii) such other information as the Task Force considers feasible and appropriate.

(3) REPORTS.—(A) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the status and work of the Task Force.

(B) Not later than May 1, 1990, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report prepared by the Task Force, which shall include—

(i) recommendations under paragraph (2)(B); and

(ii) a comprehensive summary of the programs and activities of the Task Force.

(4) TERMINATION.—The Task Force shall cease to exist 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and I have agreed to extend debate on the en bloc amendments now pending before us to 1 hour, to be equally divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, let me extend my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who has worked so diligently along with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and many others who are sponsors of a variety of amendments. We have all been shocked by the heartless and brutal attack on the unarmed students in Tiananmen Square. The American fascination with China, and the hope engendered by China's opening to the West, has been dashed by the horror of the so-called People's Liberation Army turning against the Chinese people. These events have demanded a concerted, unified, and bipartisan response.

In putting these en bloc amendments together, without their good will, their sincere and dedicated ef-

forts, it would not have been possible to speak with one voice. There was such a strong diversity of opinion, such a feeling of outrage with regard to the events of China, that we do not know where the end of a discussion with differences of opinion might have taken us.

What we have done here is a better course of action. It is wisdom for the United States to proceed in this manner, and I am delighted, therefore, to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee very much for yielding this time to me.

The en bloc amendments we now have before us on China are in my judgment a tribute to the American legislative process at its best. It is the result of serious, detailed and arduous negotiations which has taken place over the course of the last week between Members on both sides of the aisle in an effort to forge a common position with respect to the ongoing developments in China. This amendment will enable the Congress of the United States, speaking with one voice and with the support of Members on both sides of the aisle, to make it very clear to the Chinese that if they want to resume a cooperative relationship with our country, there will have to be significant improvement in the human rights situation in China.

This en bloc amendment would not have been possible, Mr. Chairman, without the very strong encouragement and support of the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. It clearly would not have been possible without the cooperation of the Arthur Vandenberg of this generation, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] who was, of course, in a rather difficult position, trying to reconcile the concerns of the White House on the one hand with those of our colleagues on the other. I want to commend the gentleman, not only for his legislative creativity, but for his political courage in terms of his willingness to support this legislation.

It also enjoyed the support of Members on both sides of the aisle who played a key role: my very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, who also played a critical role in formulating this en bloc amendment; and my good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], as well.

Inspection of the amendment will reveal the truth of the old Chinese proverb, "Victory has a thousand fathers, but defeat is an only child." This amendment clearly has a thousand fathers.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] contributed language on Tibet and the munitions control list.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] contributed language on the sale of satellites, nuclear cooperation, and human rights.

The gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] gave us language on Fang Lizhi.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] contributed language on Hong Kong.

My very good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] spearheaded the effort to include language on the Overseas Private Investment Corp.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] gave us language, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], on Tibet.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] insisted quite effectively on the inclusion of language with respect to the Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with Tibet.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], ably assisted by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE], successfully sought the inclusion of language in here which will have the effect of freezing any further liberalization of technology exports to China, not just by the United States, but by every country in Cocom for the next 6 months.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a very important amendment. It codifies into law a series of measures already announced by the President of the United States over the course of the last 2 weeks. It makes the lifting of those sanctions or suspensions contingent on a report by the President that the People's Republic of China has embarked on a program of political reform that would include a cessation of the executions which are now underway, the release of political prisoners arrested because of their involvement in the prodemocracy demonstrations, the cessation of jamming of the broadcast of the Voice of America on which hundreds of millions of Chinese are dependent for whatever objective information they receive, and greater freedom of the press and freedom of expression in China itself, as well as the lifting of martial law.

□ 1140

It also includes, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and our Republican friends, language which gives the President the right, if the national-security interests of the Nation compel it, to lift any of these suspensions. It is clearly the hope of the Congress that that will not be used or be necessary, and that the primary reliance will be put on the degree to which China has complied with the needed improvements in human rights which are called for in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that our Nation is always most effective abroad when we are united at home, and I very much hope, even at this late date, that the President of the United States will find it possible to endorse this legislation. He has, in effect, assumed the position of the desk officer for China in the administration. He has characterized himself as the leading Sinologist in the administration. He spent time there. He knows China well. We respect his knowledge of that country. We respect his constitutional prerogatives as President. But we have responsibilities as well. Some of us have been to China also, and I think I speak for Members on both sides of the aisle when I say that it is the view of the House and of the American people that our relationship with China will necessarily be significantly influenced by the respect which they are prepared to show for some of the fundamental human rights of their own people.

There are some who have said that there is nothing we can do to affect the course of events in China. It may be true that, in the short term, there is not much we can do to affect the course of events in China, but over the near term and the long run, we may have an opportunity to exert some limited influence on the future of China.

Once the gerontocracy which has seized power in China passes from the scene, as they inevitably will in the next few years, a struggle for power will inevitably emerge in China between hard liners and moderates. It is essential for us to deprive the hard liners of the argument that they can engage in the massive repression of their own people without paying any price whatsoever for it in term of their relationship with the West.

It is equally important for us to strengthen the hand of moderates within the ruling circles in China who will be arguing that in order for China to advance into the modern age they need the trade and technology and assistance of the West, but unless they back off from the repressive actions on which they have embarked, they will not be able to get the kind of cooperation they need.

I think this amendment, in addition to expressing the outrage of the American people over the repression of the democracy movement in China, can also play a limited but constructive role in influencing in a positive direction the future course of events in China. I hope, therefore, that it will enjoy the overwhelming support of Members on both sides of the aisle as

a very important reaffirmation of fundamental American values.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACOBS) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the following enrolled bill:

S. 694. An act to extend title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1989

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and others who have worked on this en bloc amendment. I have to say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] is right that this is an important piece of legislation, and I wholeheartedly support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret we were unable to get the backing of the administration on this en bloc amendment. We came very close to putting together a product they would not oppose.

However, I understand their position. I met with Secretary Baker this morning. He stated his reservations, and I respect his position.

The administration feels that this is a very delicate situation. I myself cannot remember a situation that was as volatile as this one. There is good reason to believe that the basic causes of the recent unrest will continue to have an impact on the domestic situation on China.

The President needs some flexibility in coming years as events in China play themselves out.

The prodemocracy movement is not dead, and the United States still retains some influence within the Chinese Government. President Bush knows a wide range of top level officials in China, and I would have to agree that he is as well placed as any American to influence the outcome of this difficult situation.

At the same time he had made it clear to the Chinese leadership by word and deed that America does not share their lack of respect for basic human rights.

Consider the actions he has taken: he has condemned the tactics of the Chinese leadership; he has suspended arms exports and high level government-to-government contacts; he has imposed restrictions on OPIC insurance; and he has extended the visas of Chinese nationals in the United States.

But the President has also kept the diplomatic door open. By keeping our Ambassador in Beijing, he's still able to exert influence within the Chinese Government.

It's a fast moving situation and President Bush has chosen wisely among his options.

The amendment recognizes that fact. It commends him for his condemnation of the killings and for his sanctions. It also recognizes the importance of giving the administration the ability to manage a flexible response to changing events.

And it recognizes the importance of speaking with one voice. When this Nation is unified, it succeeds. When it is divided, it fails.

As we all know, the President is responsible for the conduct of America's foreign policy. This amendment is not an attempt to undercut that responsibility. It simply recognizes that Congress has a role in stating broad policy directions.

The China situation is an inviting issue to demagogue. The fact that we haven't done so shows that Congress is capable of managing a bipartisan foreign policy not only on the easy issues, but on the difficult ones as well.

But the Chinese leadership should be aware that there is a very deep-seated revulsion in Congress about the barbarian tactics they have employed. And that there is not one person in this House who believes China's big lies about what happened in Beijing.

There's such a thing as decent human behavior. Acting like a decent human being is something incumbent on all of us—in every era, in every nation, in every culture, in every political system.

The amendment sends a strong message of China: America is not going to give you all kinds of economic benefits as long as you are slaughtering your young. If you want a share of economic prosperity, show us that you also share a commitment to basic human rights.

This is a balanced amendment. It commends the President and supports his policies. It does not tie the President's hands. It gives the President the flexibility he needs. But it also makes it clear that the Chinese cannot continue to terrorize their own people and hope to escape any consequences. This legislation ties progress on human rights to improved relations with the United States.

The alternative to this en bloc amendment would be a sting of individual amendments that would satisfy neither the administration's desire for a free hand nor the Congress desire to have some real affect on the outcome in China. We need a unified foreign policy, not a chaotic foreign policy.

□ 1150

I want to commend most sincerely my very good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], who has worked so hard on this, for their willingness to compromise and their work on shaping this amendment.

I would be remiss if I did not pay special tribute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], for their important work in drafting this amendment. This is an important piece of legislation, and I want to emphasize what the gentleman from New York, Mr. STEVE SOLARZ said, that I hope this amendment passes, and I hope we have a strong vote on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to associate myself with the very fine remarks of the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. They are right in line, of course, and we all should be supporting this en bloc package.

I commend the committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for the excellent job the committee has done on this. It contains two of my amendments dealing with suspending all exports of satellite sales to China, and very strong language concerning the atrocious human rights violations that the gentleman from Michigan has spoken so eloquently about.

I hope that both sides of the aisle will unanimously adopt these en bloc amendments. It will send exactly the kind of message we need.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York for his comments.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also want to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], and all others who worked so hard on this compro-

mise. I know it has not been easy for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], or many of us, but I think it is a very balanced, strong, good resolution and I hope it will be unanimously supported.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues in supporting this amendment praising the President and in expressing my outrage about the situation in the People's Republic of China and in condemning the Communist Chinese Government's brutal suppression of the prodemocracy movement. Sadly, this is not the first time the Communists in China have used violence and bloodshed to enforce their will. Since seizing power in 1949, hundreds of thousands—some say millions—of innocent Chinese have been murdered by the Communists. I fully agree with you that the overwhelmingly brutal force used by the Chinese Army to squash the peaceful democratic movement is abhorrent. The false charges and sham tribunals used to convict student leaders and sentence them to death by firing squad are cruel and outrageous.

Congress, through resolutions I cosponsored and we passed, has joined the President and the rest of the Nation in condemning the Chinese Government's actions. The next step was taken by President Bush through invoking a set of targeted military, high technology, and financial sanctions. Our goal remains to pressure the Chinese Government, not hurt the Chinese people.

Despite these sanctions and other actions, like providing extensions to the visas of Chinese students here in the United States, the Communist Beijing government continues its bloody crackdown. Those involved in the prodemocracy movement are being sought out and severely punished. Some have been executed. These actions remind us of the mayhem and terror of earlier years, like the cultural revolution period.

Events in China do affect our national security and global stability. I inserted into Tuesday's—June 27—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very insightful commentary by former President Nixon—someone who knows both strategic issues and China well. I strongly urge my colleagues to review this article. The situation in China is a very emotional one crying out for action. It is also a very complex one that has ramifications beyond the Great Wall. While action against the PRC Government is warranted and needed, we must be cognizant of other strategic and national security factors and make sure that our actions compliment our strategic policy, not jeopardize it. I strongly believe there are additional measures—punitive sanctions—which are both responsible and responsive. Clearly, should the situation fail to improve or worsen, even more comprehensive sanctions should be seriously considered.

I am very encouraged that the key congressional leaders on this legislation—the elected party leadership, Chairmen FASCELL and SOLARZ, and Vice Chairman BROOMFIELD have been working very closely with the administration to come up with responsible and responsive measures to include in this foreign aid bill. It is critical for the United States to "speak loudly with one voice." I look forward to supporting bold bipartisan actions that will help make the price of continued repression by the Communist authorities too high to bear.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I thank the gentleman from California for his comments.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and apologize for not having heard the earlier part of his dissertation here on the floor. I assume from the earlier conversations that we had over the last several days that his position would be consistent with my position of applauding the President for what he has done up to this point, and quite frankly being rather reluctant to go beyond that since I do have the utmost confidence in the President.

But I also recognize full well that in this House, as deliberative a body as it is, with men of different minds and feelings from time to time, it is very important that in foreign policy we do forge a bipartisan foreign policy. Yes, with the President's leadership, but certainly it has to have the support of a good body of Congress.

I would also join the gentleman in his accolades to those on the Democratic side of the aisle who have been so instrumental in helping forge the kind of language upon which we can all agree. That is the way it ought to be, and it does not come easy. To those of my colleagues who have been working behind closed doors with candles at night and all of the rest, arguing over a couple of words or a little phrase here or there, we applaud you for hanging in and sticking with it and coming to the floor with something that all of us can support with good conscience.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendments and I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], our ranking minority member, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the chairman of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee for working so hard together to bring before us this well balanced China sanction legislation.

In essence our omnibus China measure strongly states that: the United States continues to hold in high regard the ideals of nonviolent protest and political change; that Americans were shocked, saddened, and sickened by the barbaric slaughter in Tiananmen Square and Tibet; and, that we strongly support the efforts of those who are willing to risk their lives for the ideals of liberty, democracy, and human rights that we hold so dear.

A significant sanction in this measure in response to the violations of human rights calls for the cancellation and prohibition of arms sales to the PRC. We were in the process of selling avionics packages for their F–8's fighter jets, artillery radar, and naval missiles. Obviously the events in China necessitate a cancellation of these special contracts. These en bloc amendments codify what President Bush has called for.

For me and many of my colleagues here who have worked so hard on the Tibet issue this legislation it extremely important. It represents a welcome recognition of the central role Tibet must play in that our policy toward the PRC. The nonviolent human rights movement there must be supported just as strongly as the one by the Chinese themselves. A Chinese student who is a leader in the movement here in the United States very recently said that if the students do not recognize that the Tibetans are their brothers in this struggle then right from the start the effort to create a democracy in China will fail.

Most importantly this legislation reflects our belief that human rights and democracy, U.S. national security interests won't somehow magically follow economic reforms. And economic investments by Western private sector interests will never flourish in an atmosphere of oppression. If we want so badly the market that China represents, if we want her to be a positive force in the global community, if we have reason to depend on China in military terms and geopolitical strategies, then we must strongly condemn and act unequivocally against the repression.

The only China that will emerge from the continuation of the world's policy of turning its back on nonviolent protesters in China and Tibet is the ugly dinosaur we see now. It squashed thousands of Tibetan human rights protestors and now consumed its own offspring. The leaders in the PRC serve little value to the Western World's foreign policy goals or the noble call of the ancient Chinese culture.

China at present is at ground zero. Her best and brightest have been killed, arrested, or are in hiding. Her future hope depends on the education that we and other Western nations give to the thousands of students that are being harbored in the West. That education will begin with how our democracy, their temporary home, responds to the crisis in their country. These en bloc amendments will serve as a good first lesson and I urge our colleagues to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations.

□ 1200

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Chairman, as a coauthor of this legislation I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendment. I would first like to commend Mr. FASCELL and Mr. BROOMFIELD for their bipartisan efforts in constructing this amendment. I also commend Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. WEISS for their contributions in crafting this legislation, as well as the other principle sponsors.

This en bloc takes into account the many concerns raised by Members regarding the killings that took place in the PRC and the stepped up repression against the Chinese people. The sanctions contained in this amendment will be repealed when the Chinese Government takes concrete steps to reverse the repressive measures imposed over the last few weeks.

Those concrete steps include suspending martial law, ending reprisals against prodemocracy participants, and releasing political prisoners.

Mr. Chairman, the rapprochement between Beijing and Washington initiated in the early seventies is commonly known as the process of normalization. Beijing's definition of normalization seems to exclude progress on human rights. However, U.S. relations with the international community are predicated on respect for human rights and individual liberties. That is how we define normalizing relations with other countries.

We must send a clear message to Beijing that the loss of private capital, skills, and technological know-how is the price it must pay for its disregard for human life. It is my hope that other governments will join the United States in using military and economic sanctions as a tool to influence change in China.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment appropriately commends President Bush for his leadership. His expertise with respect to China has enormously strengthened our policy response during this trying period in our bilateral relationship.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. DYMALLY TO THE EN BLOC AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on line 6 of page 6 of the current amendment, after the word "arrests" there be inserted the words, "abuse of African students,".

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have no objection, and we certainly support the gentleman's efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for their cooperation in permitting me to offer this modification.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], indeed to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, the entire Committee on Foreign Affairs, for their efforts to fashion this bipartisan approach, the important United States policy toward the People's Republic of China.

I am also grateful for the leadership and cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

I am pleased that the amendment which I have offered, cosponsored by Mr. SOLARZ and Mr. YATRON to suspend new OPIC coverage in China, has been incorporated in the en bloc amendment offered by the chairman.

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or OPIC, is a U.S. Government entity created by the Congress in 1969 to promote two important goals of American foreign policy: First, to encourage American investment in developing countries by offering U.S. Government insurance against the risk of political violence and expropriation; and second, to provide an economic benefit to those developing countries by promoting foreign investment there.

The amendment now under consideration recognizes that, with respect to both of these goals, new OPIC coverage in the People's Republic of China cannot be justified.

The events we have witnessed over the last few weeks—the brutal massacre in Tiananmen Square of students and other civilians engaged in peaceful assembly, presentation of petitions, hunger strikes, and the burning of Chinese flags, the audacity of the official government lies about this slaughter, and the systematic pattern of arrests and executions which followed—clearly make it impossible for the United States to provide guarantees against the risk of political violence in China.

Furthermore, OPIC insurance is intended to provide assistance to countries that are moving toward economic and political liberalization; not, as in the case with China, to countries that slaughter hundreds, perhaps thousands, of unarmed demonstrators in a public square. The current, hard-line Government of China does not deserve to be the beneficiary of our Nation's foreign assistance programs, and thus, OPIC activities in China should be suspended until the Chinese Government has embarked on a program of significant political reforms.

It should be pointed out to the Chinese leaders as well, that no matter what they say, business from this country and probaby from elsewhere in the world will not go into their country until, in fact, it is assured that the kind of acts by the Chinese Government which we have witnessed the past 6 weeks will not recur.

What we have provided in this en bloc amendment are clear guidelines of steps they must take in order to be dealt with as respectable members of the international community.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this country or abroad can harbor any illusions about the depth of outrage and concern of the people and Government of the United States at the brutal repression now under way in the People's Republic of China.

The success of American diplomacy has historically depended, and must continue to depend, on what George Kennan has trenchantly characterized as its "inherent honesty and openness of purpose and on the forthrightness with which it is carried out." Deprive us of these traits and we are deprived of our strongest armor and our most effective weapon.

In this context, the Chinese people must be made aware that Americans are unanimously supportive of the movement for democracy, for emancipation, for human freedom in the world's largest country.

Whereas the executive branch is primarily responsible for government-to-government relations, it is the Con-

gress that symbolizes people-to-people concerns and values. It is, therefore, altogether fitting and proper that the people's body of America should make it unequivocally clear to the people of China, our great distress about the butchery in Beijing and the brutal reimposition of Stalinist totalitarian control in China.

There are times in the history of all nation states when their fundamental character is revealed either by demonstrations of clemency and compassion or by dogmatic firmness and resolve. Given the unrefutable truth in the pictures being brought by televisions into every living room in the free world, no one can conceivably buy the "Goebbels" like assertion that it was the People's Liberation Army and the Communist authorities who were attacked by unarmed students. An army of the people does not turn on the people. Communist hard liners now ruling the Peoples' Republic of China must understand that the history of civilization teaches that killing by tyrants makes martyrs, and martyrdom cannot be slain.

Guns and bullets in the hands of an oppressive army can delay the fulfillment of aspirations, but they cannot kill the human dream.

In the strongest possible terms, this body has the responsibility to proclaim to our own citizens, to the world and in particular, to the Chinese leadership that students should not be executed for having the courage to peacefully express the values and philosophies they have learned. Hard-toiling workers should not be summarily arrested and shot for having the courage to express their rights. A legitimate People's Republic must be of, by and for the people, not of, by and for a narrow political gerontocracy.

This amendment that we have before us is the least we can do to express American values in the wake of one of the most tragic events of this decade.

I urge that the leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], be followed and this amendment adopted and supported at this time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Florida, Chairman FASCELL, for his leadership in pulling the various Members and interests in this Congress together on a resolution that unifies our position and unifies the great strength of the American character.

It is clear there are economic opportunities in China and there are profits that can be made in China, but there are no profits so large and no markets so immense that we set aside the values that hold Americans together as a nation.

□ 1210

We have seen in these last weeks the Congress being the real leader in the American response to the Chinese massacre of its own students. The Members of the Congress and our colleagues in the Senate are leading the struggle for democracy, as we have so often in the past.

The Chinese people have gone through a watershed. The brave students in China, having given their lives, have earned for the Chinese people a new standard for democracy and freedom, a new standard by which their Government must treat them.

We have to recognize that there is no silver bullet. What we have before us today will not alter the Chinese Government's behavior overnight. There is no one simple act that will put an end to the bloodshed, the massacre, and the mock trials of the Chinese citizens, but this is the beginning of a long struggle.

In 1974, the Jackson-Vanik amendments passed the House and the Senate. The President signed into law, and through the dark days, when barely a thousand Jews were let out of the Soviet Union and Uzbeks and others were kept behind bars, this Congress remained steadfast in fighting for freedom.

I am heartened to see the European Community joining with us in objecting to multilateral assistance to the Chinese Government for economic programs. The subcommittee that I chair has moved and has incorporated in this bill legislation that will stop an increase in the technology transfer to China, not just for American corporations but for all corporations that come from countries in the Cocom organization. We will stop an increase in the level of technology in a multilateral manner, and I would call on the President to take leadership from the Congress and run with it.

We have had economic summits to strengthen the economic security of the West. We held military summits with our NATO allies to strengthen our military posture. It is time for the leaders of these great Western nations to hold summits on democracy, to bring the various leaders of our democratic friends and neighbors together to help foster democracy across the globe, to have not simply the United States or the Europeans or the Japanese make their individual statements for freedom and in support of the students of China and the people of China, but to do this as a Western world, to do it as westerners who have stood up economically and militarily to fight for freedom, to do so now to fight for freedom in its very essence as the Chinese people have struggled for their own freedom.

Our challenge will be to understand that this is not simply a 1-day activity, that what we do here today begins the struggle to fight for freedom, to help the Chinese people, to help the Chinese people in their own struggle, where they obviously are the key to success. This is a long struggle that we in the Congress are entering, with the great work of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. We have engaged in this struggle, and I hope that we have the character and the strength of character to continue that struggle to its conclusion.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, many have believed that Chinese politics over the past few years have been mellowing vis-a-vis human rights and freedom, but many of us remember the 30 million people who were killed under Chairman Mao during the Cultural Revolution in the 1950's.

This is still a Communist regime, and Communist regimes around the world, when necessary, use the iron fist to maintain control. This regime is no different. They are ready, willing and able to crush anyone who wants freedom in that country. Its tyrannical control, and they are using it not only in China but in Tibet as well.

I do not know if many of our Members saw those pictures of the remains of a Chinese student who had been run over by a tank, but that is the way they treat their people when they want freedom. We as a Congress and as a nation must send a very strong signal to China that we are not going to stand idly by and watch these atrocities and tortures and human rights violations take place. I personally believe that we should do a lot more. But this is at least a step in the right direction, and I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this en bloc amendment.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], just said, this should not be a 1-day event. We should keep the pressure on and let the Chinese Communists and all Communists around the world know that we are not going to close our eyes to their tyranny, to the way they treat their people, and to the human rights violations and tragedies that have befallen these people. We should push for freedom.

John F. Kennedy, when he was President, talked about this. He said

that we should go any place in the world and pay any price to help people get freedom. We should do that in China as well.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the full committee, the chairman of the various subcommittees, especially the chairman of the subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], and the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, as well as the ranking members, for their work in crafting this en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the savagery of the Chinese Government's attack against Chinese students and workers who were calling for democratic reform has clearly outraged the world and the American people. I think it is important to reflect on this tragedy and to remind the Chinese Government and our friends among the Chinese population that before the Tiananmen Square massacre Americans had for the most part come to think of China as a country that was on the path of reform, as a nation that was intent on increasing economic and political freedom for its people, and as a friend with which we would continue to develop business, political, and cultural ties.

But the butchery in Beijing, the swift executions, and the mass arrests and imprisonment of protestors have dealt a profound blow to the affection with which the American people had come to view the Government of the People's Republic of China.

As this affection has turned to horror, we have heard a very cautious response from our own Government which unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, might not have impressed adequately upon the Chinese Government the seriousness with which the American people view the behavior of the Chinese Government.

Yet I ask my colleagues and the American people have asked us, how is it possible to turn the other cheek when the Chinese Government is executing people simply because they want democracy, because they stood up for the very principles that are the heart of our own society and our own Government?

I frankly do not see how we can equivocate about a matter so central to our own fundamental beliefs and ideals.

I have an amendment to this bill, Mr. Chairman, which would suspend export licenses to the People's Republic of China for 6 months. It would prevent the Chinese from getting from us what they want the most—our technology. I believe this would be an appropriate step for the United States to take in view of the gravity of the Chinese regime's crimes.

Yet in light of the very strong action of the committee, I will strongly support the effforts of our committee's en bloc amendments to increase the cost to the Chinese of their gross human rights violations, and I particular applaud the sections of the en bloc amendments which restrict munitions export licenses, which limit nuclear cooperation with the People's Republic, and which suspend any liberization of export controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, the restrictions in the en bloc amendment to which I am referring incorporate several aspects of my own, and I am very pleased that they received the full bipartisan support of the committee. I am also pleased that the Foreign Affairs Committee will soon take an in-depth look at the situation and recent events in China, and will review present and future United States options in response to the Chinese crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the committee to consider the sanctions in my amendment as an additional step if conditions do not improve in the People's Republic.

Mr. Chairman, in light of the strong en bloc amendments offered by the leadership of this committee, I will not offer the amendment that I had intended to offer at this time, and I stand in strong support of the en bloc amendments.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let me join with those who have commended the committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for all of their acts of support on these particular en bloc amendments.

We all marveled and warmed at the scenes of the young prodemocratic students in China raising the statue of liberty as their symbol. I hope we also recognize and warm to our responsibilities to now stand with these students in their time of trial and need.

□ 1230

As we witnessed the horror of China, I quickly recognized the need that we step forth and try to respond to those students, and I am delighted that section (f) of the amendment in front of us responds to those needs. There are some 39,000 Chinese students and scholars here in the United States today. Approximately 29,000 students are studying at accredited American colleges and universities, another 10,000 are visiting scholars and students at unaccredited universities. Many of them are J-1 visas, some are here on F-1 visas, but the reality is, if we only temporarily extend their visa, we give them no certainty of whether we will be there to help them in time of need financially, workwise, or otherwise. We give them no signal that this is going to be a long-term commitment, and none of us, and certainly can we expect none of them, are going to risk the possibilities of the torture and consequences that could be placed upon them if we changed our minds later on. They are not going to come forth and ask for that extension of their visas unless we send them some signal that we stand ready to permanently help them to stay here until real change occurs in China.

Mr. Chairman, that means a lot of things. As we contacted different Government agencies, frankly no one today can tell us what those things are going to be in American policy to give them the assistance financially, workwise, immigrationwise, or otherwise.

So, we have created in section (f) a task force headed up by the Secretary of State with the other governmental agencies to really look into and assess these specific needs and the status of the citizens that are here to recommend both to the Congress and to the President the programs and policy changes that are necessary to create, directly or indirectly, a clearinghouse that can work with our universities and to report back to us within 60 days so that we might move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the en bloc amendment to title IX of H.R. 2655. Twenty-four days after the soldiers brutally massacred thousands of students and citizens in Beijing who were peacefully demonstrating to demand democracy, the fear that has swept across China is spreading to Chinese students attending schools in the United States.

As reports tell us of reprisals by the Chinese authorities against those who have called for democracy, many students studying here are unsure whether they can ever go home. The organizations that handle direct exchange programs and the college offices that deal with thousands of Chinese students who come here on their own seem uncertain and confused. According to a New York Times report, there are 29,000 Chinese students studying at accredited American colleges and universities—and more than 10,000 Chinese who are visiting scholars or students at unaccredited universities.

As the author of section 910, subsection (e) Task Force on Students From the People's Republic of China in the United States, I feel that the United States must provide an appropriate outlet to assist Chinese nationals in the United States. I feel that this task force will achieve this goal.

This task force will be chaired by the Secretary of State—or his designee—and representatives of other relevant agencies to be determined by the Secretary of State. The task force shall assess the specific needs and status of citizens of the PRC who were admitted under nonimmigrant visas to the United States and recommend to the Congress and President policies and programs to address these needs.

In addition the task force shall establish, directly or indirectly, a clearinghouse to provide such Chinese nationals and United States institutions of higher education with appropriate information, including—

First, public and private sources of financial assistance available to such nationals;

Second, information and assistance regarding visas and immigration status;

Third, other information the task force considers feasible and appropriate.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the status and work of the task force. Beginning May 1, 1990, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report prepared by the task force that will include a comprehensive summary of the programs and activities of the task force.

We must continue to express our outrage at the bloody assaults on the student protesters, but also lend assistance to those Chinese students and exchange visitors in the United States whose futures here are in limbo. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach the end of this debate on the en bloc amendment, I do want to put what we are about to do in its proper perspective. This amendment steers a very careful course between two extremes. It steers a course between those who, on the one hand, would like us to entirely sever our diplomatic and commercial relationship with China and those who, on the other hand, do not want us to take any action whatsoever with respect to China lest we disturb the sleep of Deng Xiaoping and perhaps drive the Chinese into the arms of the Soviet Union.

This amendment, in addition to codifying into law those measures already adopted by the President and establishing a standard of human rights which will have to be met if the sanctions embodied in the legislations are going to be lifted, also goes beyond the steps already taken by the President in five respects.

First, it suspended any additional Trade and Development Agency funding for the People's Republic of China, on the grounds that we should not be using taxpayers' money in light of the repression in China to facilitate increased American investment in that country.

Second, Mr. Chairman, it also prohibited the export to China of gray area nuclear equipment and technology. Third, it establishes a task force for the purpose of finding out ways to facilitate the ability of Chinese students whose visas expire to remain in the United States. Fourth, it establishes a 6-month freeze on any increase in the level of technology exports to China, not just by the United States, but by all of our Cocom partners. We have the ability to do this, given Cocom regulations which enable any one country to veto an increase in the level of technology which can be exported. Finally, it already goes beyond the steps taken by the President by prohibiting the exports to China, not just the munitions control equipment, but also of any crime control items on the grounds that we do not want to assist the Chinese secret police in their efforts to apprehend or incarcerate those involved in the democracy movement.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], my good friend.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, my original amendment expresses a requirement that the President report to the Congress that he has received a commitment from China that it will not help another country develop nuclear explosive devices. The en bloc amendment refers only to an assurance in this regard.

Can the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] explain to me the difference between these two terms?

Mr. SOLARZ. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] poses an important question, and I can tell him there is no practical difference between an assurance and a commitment. What we seek in this amendment is a clear and unequivocal indication from China that it will not and does not support the proliferation of nuclear explosives, and we should be perfectly clear that United States law prohibits any nuclear trade with China if that country assists any other in developing nuclear explosives.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs wrote the bill which contains this restriction, and the committee continues its commitment to uphold the law and U.S. nonproliferation policy, and I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] for pushing this to the front of our concern.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment which expresses the American people's strong sense of outrage over the Chinese Government's suppression and execution of the prodemocracy demonstrators. It imposes economic sanctions which I strongly support because it is the right thing to do and we cannot and should not do any less. At the same time, it gives the President flexibility in modifying them if conditions improve in China, or if he determines that it is in the national security interest to do so. This amendment is the product of close cooperation among Republicans and Democrats, and we have worked to incorporate the concerns of the administration to the extent possible.

This en bloc amendment includes a provision I drafted supporting the President's decision to grant temporary refuge to the noted Chinese intellectuals Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian at the U.S. Embassy in Beijing. My provision also urges the President to continue to provide such refuge as long as necessary to protect their personal safety.

There is a long tradition within the international community of providing temporary refuge at diplomatic missions in compelling humanitarian cases. The practice is based on the inviolability of embassies guaranteed under international law. Article 22 of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations clearly states, "The premises of the mission shall be inviolable. The agents of the receiving State may not enter them, except with the consent of the head of the mission."

In the days after the Chinese Government's brutal crackdown on unarmed prodemocracy demonstrators, events moved swiftly. In the 3 weeks since the massacre on Tiananmen Square hundreds of demonstrators and dissidents have been arrested, and at least 27 have been executed. This leaves no doubt about the personal danger Fang Lizhi would have faced if the President had not responded quickly to his request for sanctuary at the U.S. Embassy.

Only the diplomatic inviolability of our Embassy protects Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian from similar arrest and possible execution on charges of treason and counterrevolutionary activity. The "treasonous crime" that Fang has been accused of is speaking out over the years in support of democracy and human rights and stating that others had the right to speak their own minds as well.

For three decades Fang Lizhi, a renowned Chinese scientist and intellec-

tual, has spoken out courageously for human dignity, democracy, and the rights of the individual. His support for democratization and peaceful change in China has sometimes brought him internal exile and sometimes prison.

However, during China's occasional periods of openness since 1949, particularly the period most recently and brutally ended by the Chinese Government, Fang rose to prominence in China. He has been respected around the world and within his own country for his advocacy of a modern China based on democratic principles and the rights of the governed.

Ultimately, the Government of China will have to accede to the demands of its own people who demonstrated so courageously their aspirations for democratic reforms and respect for fundamental human rights.

When the Chinese Government overcomes its present madness and returns to the path of reform, Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian will be ready to resume their role in helping to build a modern, more democratic China. The President's swift humanitarian action to protect the safety of Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian at this critical moment will help to make that possible.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

□ 1230

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that we can all applaud. I commend all the people who put so much time and energy and effort into this amendment.

What is happening in China is not only important for China, but it is also very important for us. The world's largest country, China, and ourselves have many things in common. Our people are industrious. They are hard working and family oriented, so this binds our countries together and will bid us in the future also.

These are dark days for China, but I am optimistic that out of the turmoil China will one day emerge, one of the strongest democracies in the world.

Arnold Toynbee, the great historian, wrote that if you want to find what a nation is going to be like in 20 years, take a look at their young people—especially at their dreams, their hopes, their aspirations—and in 20 years that is what their country will be like. There are people no more committed to democratic ideals and none more active in politics than are the young people of China today. So I think the future for China, although it may look very dark today, will turn out very well.

It is appropriate for us to speak out. It is appropriate for us to make our views known, and that is what this amendment does. That is why I feel it is a good amendment.

This democracy growing in China is not something transplanted. It is indigenous to those people. It is like a tree that grows from a seed, an indigenous not a transplanted tree, which is always the healthiest and the strongest. That is why I feel democracy will come to China, is coming, and will be one of the strongest in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment and I hope everyone will support it.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It is a good amendment. It is something that needs to be done.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, for including my amendment in their en bloc amendments. The committee has done an excellent job crafting an amendment that sends a clear signal to the Government in China that we are willing to take concrete punitive steps in response to their unconscionable brutality.

My amendment deals with Hong Kong. That British Crown Colony is scheduled to revert to Chinese sovereignty in 1997. Since the 1984 bilateral agreement was signed between Great Britain and the PRC that provided for the transfer, the Chinese Government has systematically reneged on most guarantees for Hong Kong's future freedoms.

The massacre in Beijing and the ongoing arrests and assassinations of innocent people, continues to undermine all of the guarantees given to Hong Kong and Great Britain.

The people of Hong Kong are nervous. Millions demonstrated before and following the Tiananmen murders. The stock market fell more than 25 percent, and this year alone over 45,000 Hong Kong citizens will leave the territory.

My part of the en bloc amendment expresses the sense of Congress that China's guarantee to Hong Kong for a high degree of autonomy has no credibility and the United States must initiate an international effort to guarantee human rights and the development of democratic institutions in Hong Kong. It directs the President and the Secretary of State to tell the PRC and the United Kingdom our strong reservations with respect to the absence of guarantees of free direct elections and human rights in the proposed basic law now being drafted.

Hong Kong needs our help, Mr. Chairman, and the United States should stand firmly behind its 5.7 million people as they struggle to protect their future economic and personal freedoms.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I just wanted to add my comment that in these en bloc amendments is an amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] having to do with exporting licenses to take American satellite technology and allow it to be placed on the Chinese Long March rocket at the very time that we are trying to encourage an infant industry of commercial expendable launch vehicles. That is clearly not in the interest of the United States and I applaud the gentleman for including the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in these en bloc amendments.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time to pay tribute to our new majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]. He did a great deal to bring all the Members together to fashion this bipartisan compromise that we are considering. I want the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] to know we appreciate his hard work.

I am also very grateful to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] for all his work to make this successful.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this set of amendments, which I feel have been well crafted and well put together on behalf of the entire House.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and the members on both sides in the committee and off the committee who have worked so well together in the past few days to make a strong statement about the situation in China, not only in words, but in legislation.

A few days ago we took a march to the Embassy of the People's Republic of China here in Washington. It was a bipartisan march. We met with the Ambassador. We expressed our feelings and while we did not get a great

deal of satisfaction, at least we were able to say what we thought on behalf of the American people.

I am delighted today that we are sending a clear, undivided message to the leaders in China about what we hope will happen in China in the days ahead. I think it is important that the House lead on this issue.

I understand that the President and Secretary Baker may have a little different view of how to proceed. I respect their decision. I respect what they believe is the right way to go. But I think some part of this Government—and today it is the House—has to speak clearly on behalf of the American people and take more forceful action than the President and the Secretary of State have been willing to make to date.

I understand the feeling of some people that doing this, passing these amendments, may not change things. But I would urge Members to remember that that is what was said with regard to South Africa many, many times in the past few years. That is what has been said about Poland since 1981. That is what was said about the Philippines when they began to experience unrest. People said, "Don't act. Don't do anything."

That is what was said about Vietnam when they were sending refugees out to the sea.

The truth is that the action that America took in the cases, along with other nations around the world, did bring change. These amendments can bring change, and that is why this statement is so important.

We say today through these actions to the Government of China, "The whole world is watching you. Don't try to rewrite history. Return to the community of nations by ceasing the brutal repression of your own people. Stop the killing now."

A young Chinese American student from the University of Missouri wrote me last weekend and said that the blood of the Chinese students is fertilizing the tree of democracy. We endorse these words by our actions today.

□ 1240

I am proud that we stand in an undivided way and that we send a clear, unequivocal message to the Government of China, "Stop the killing now."

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendment on China, and in particular, in support of section (c)(6) of the amendment, which suspends all peaceful nuclear energy cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

This section is derived from a floor amendment which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I had originally prepared to offer to the bill. In discussions with the distinguished chairman of the Asia Subcommittee [Mr. SOLARZ] and the chairman of the full committee [Mr. FASCELL], we have worked out a compromise which I feel sends an important signal to China that it cannot expect peaceful nuclear energy cooperation to continue until China's crackdown on the prodemocracy movement ends and China provides the United States with stronger nuclear nonproliferation assurances.

I think that we are taking an important step here today in both reaffirming our Nation's commitment to democracy and human rights, but also in reaffirming our commitment to halting the spread of nuclear weapons. As the author of the original language from which section (c)(6) is derived, I would like to take a few minutes to explain the significance of the amendment's provisions on nuclear technology exports.

What this section of the en bloc amendment does is suspend all peaceful nuclear energy cooperation between the United States and the People's Republic of China. The section suspends all export licenses for nuclear technologies, nuclear materials, and nuclear components subject to the 1985 United States-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. It suspends any nuclear technology transfers outside of the agreement using the authority provided by section 57(b) of the Atomic Energy Act. It suspends exports of all so-called dual use nuclear-related equipment under section 309(c) of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act.

These nuclear exports are suspended until three basic conditions are met.

First, the President would have to make the certification regarding ending martial law, halting executions, and other reprisals against the prodemocracy movement, releasing political prisoners, and increasing respect for human rights.

Second, the President would have to make the certifications regarding nonproliferation safeguards and Chinese nonproliferation policies and activities required under the 1985 congressional resolution approving the United States-China Nuclear Cooperation Agreement.

Third, the President has to certify that the People's Republic of China has provided clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any nonnuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the materials and components for such devices.

I believe that making each of these three certifications is vitally important before the United States permits peaceful nuclear cooperation with China to resume. Given the recent events in China, there is no justification for our Nation to continue to provide sensitive nuclear technologies to China, a country that has never signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1968 and has repeatedly expressed its disdain for that agreement in both word and deed.

As many of you will recall, in 1985 the United States signed a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with China. The agreement was controversial because it didn't contain a guaranty that safeguards would be maintained for all United States nuclear materials and equipment transferred to China and it did not give the United States a guaranty of prior approval of reprocessing, enrichment, or alteration of nuclear material, as required by law.

As my colleagues may know, for years there have been press reports, citing intelligence sources, indicating that China has been providing assistance to the Pakistani nuclear program. There have been reports that Pakistani officials traveled to China in 1983 to witness a nuclear test and receive weapons design information from China. Just 1 month ago, the press reported that China has been making arrangements for a Pakistani nuclear test at its Lop Nur testing ground. There have also been reports that China has shared nuclear technology with Iran, South Africa, Brazil, and Argentina—nations poised right on the nuclear threshold.

In addition, according to testimony earlier this year by CIA Director William Webster, "China is actively promoting the export of shorter-range ballistic missiles" and that China is a willing supplier of missile technology to countries like Iran.

That is the proliferation record of the country that we are talking about here. I think that record suggests we can no more trust a wink and a nod from the Chinese leadership on nuclear proliferation than we can trust their claims that a massacre never took place in Tiananmen Square. What we need are clear and unequivocal assurances from China that it is not and will not assist any other state in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or materials. In addition we need continued close monitoring by the United States intelligence community to see that China is living up to these commitments.

Back in 1985, Congress was concerned enough about China's nonproliferation record that we put conditions on the resolution approving the agreement. Ironically, these certifications were far weaker than those which we have traditionally required for nuclear exports to friendly Western countries like Great Britain and Sweden.

We did not demand international safeguards at all civilian nuclear facilities. We did not require a public, written statement of Chinese nonproliferation policy. We did not ask for an official Chinese interpretation of the agreement's language on consent rights. We did not ask for the Chinese interpretation of the agreement's language on the future applicability of United States export laws and regulations, but simply restated the United States position.

Nevertheless, in the 3½ years that have elapsed since Congress passed the approval resolution, neither President Reagan nor President Bush have been willing to make the required certifications or submit the report required under the law. Why do you think that is?

Could it be because we haven't received the nonproliferation assurances that we were seeking from Li Peng and his cronies in Beijing?

Could it be because the Chinese have continued their reckless proliferation policies?

Could it be because we still don't have agreement on the verification measures that would be needed to assure that U.S. supplied nuclear technology and nuclear materials are not diverted from peaceful to military purposes?

I think the likely answer to each of these questions is a resounding yes, and it is the lack of verification, the lack of clear and unequivocal nonproliferation commitments from China, the continuing evidence that China has not halted its nuclear cooperation with the Pakistanis, explains why those certifications haven't been made allowing nuclear exports to go forward.

Despite the lack of Presidential certifications, however, some very significant nuclear cooperation has taken place during the last 3½ years. The approval resolution we passed back in 1985 had some big loopholes: It affected only nuclear export licenses, and transfers of nuclear material, facilities, and components, which Reagan administration officials have testified the Chinese would have difficulty affording. It didn't affect transfers of nuclear technologies and assistance, such as technology transfers under CFR 810, and it didn't affect sensitive nuclear-related technologies on the Commerce Department's commodity control list.

More than a dozen technology transfers have been approved in the last 4 years and two are pending right now. In addition, it appears that exports of nuclear-sensitive dual use technologies have also been approved with the agreement itself formally going into effect. Those are loopholes big enough to fire a nuclear warhead through.

Section (c)(6) of the en bloc amendment closes the loopholes and assures that all significant forms of nuclear cooperation between the United States and China would be suspended until the political situation in China significantly improves and until the United States receives clear and unequivocal assurances that the Chinese Government has a commitment not to help Pakistan or any other nonweapons state in acquiring nuclear weapons.

In addition to the human rights and martial law certificates required in the en bloc amendment, section (c)(6) contains some important new nonproliferation language.

In place of the previous requirement in P.L. 99-183, which called on China to provide "additional information concerning its nuclear non-proliferation policies," section (c)(6) requires the President to certify to Congress that the People's Republic of China has provided:

clear and unequivocal assurances to the United States that it is not assisting and will not assist any non-nuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive devices or the materials and components for such devices.

In other words, what we are asking for is more than just information from the Chinese about their nonproliferation policies, what we are asking for are clear assurances that indicate that China has committed itself not to provide assistance to nonweapons states like Pakistan in acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities. That is what we are looking for.

We are not offering this language in the naive belief that those assurances can be trusted. Everyone should know now—if they didn't already—that the mere word of the Chinese leadership cannot be trusted by itself. So what we need to do is assure that United States intelligence sources continue to closely monitor those assurances to verify whether the Chinese are in fact not proliferating. If Chinese Government assurances prove to be no more reliable than claims by the Chinese leadership that no massacre ever occurred in Tiananmen Square, the amendment reaffirms that United States would suspend nuclear cooperation with China under the provisions of section 129 of the Atomic Energy Act.

It is time for us to take a stand. We can either stand on the side of the pro-democracy students who faced down the tanks on Tiananmen Square, or we can stand with those who ordered those tanks in to crush the Chinese people's aspirations for freedom and democracy.

Now is the time for us to make our voices heard. Now is the time for us to show some leadership and send a message to the people of China and the old men in control in Beijing. Now is the time to pass this amendment to halt all nuclear cooperation with China.

I urge support for the en bloc amendment.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of en bloc amendment to title IX of H.R. 2655.

On June 4, 1989, the Government of the People's Republic of China massacred over 700 unarmed Chinese citizens in Tiananmen Square. Since then, more than 20 citizens have been executed and hundreds have been incarcerated for participating in the pro-democracy movement.

As the leader of the free world, I feel it is vital that we, the people of the United States, take a stand against such heinous acts. We must let the Chinese Government know that such brutality will not be tolerated by the world community.

Many words have been spoken to condemn the Chinese Government for what it did and for what it continues to do, but I believe more substantive measures must be taken. Therefore, I support the sanction provisions in this bill.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support these amendments, en bloc, which address the current crisis in China. The situation in China today is very grave and disturbing. With passage of these amendments we will send a clear message of condemnation to the Chinese Government for its brutal actions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning China's recent acts of violence by supporting these amendments—particularly the provisions urging the U.N. General Assembly and the U.N. Security Council to condemn China for its recent actions.

Mr. Chairman, the propaganda, violent suppression, mass arrests, and brutal executions we see now in China have another, less apparent dimension—regional stability.

Regional peace in Asia, and world peace are threatened by the recent human rights violations in China. One-fifth of the world's population lies within the borders of the People's Republic of China. When the leaders of a powerful nation trample on the human rights of their people during times of international peace, these leaders are also more likely to provoke international hostilities. The recent brutal human rights violations in China have national security implications for countries of that region such as Korea, Tibet, Hong Kong, Vietnam, and Taiwan.

Because human rights in a country as populous as China may have serious implications for the stability of the Asia-Pacific region, the U.N. should act in condemning China and in urging the Chinese Government to enter into negotiations with the representatives of the pro-democratic movement.

Mr. Chairman, regional security and stability in East Asia are important U.S. concerns. The United States Government cannot shy away from being tough on the Chinese Government for their continued massive violation of human rights.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], as modified.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

AYES—418

Ackerman	Clay	Fields
Akaka	Clement	Fish
Alexander	Clinger	Flake
Anderson	Coble	Flippo
Andrews	Coleman (MO)	Foglietta
Annunzio	Coleman (TX)	Ford (MI)
Anthony	Combest	Ford (TN)
Applegate	Conte	Frank
Archer	Conyers	Frenzel
Armey	Cooper	Frost
Aspin	Costello	Gallegly
Atkins	Coughlin	Gallo
AuCoin	Cox	Garcia
Baker	Coyne	Gaydos
Ballenger	Craig	Gejdenson
Barnard	Crane	Gekas
Bartlett	Crockett	Gephardt
Barton	Dannemeyer	Gibbons
Bateman	Darden	Gillmor
Bates	Davis	Gilman
Beilenson	de la Garza	Gingrich
Bennett	DeFazio	Glickman
Bereuter	DeLay	Gonzalez
Berman	Dellums	Goodling
Bevill	Derrick	Gordon
Bilbray	DeWine	Goss
Bilirakis	Dickinson	Gradison
Bliley	Dicks	Grandy
Boehlert	Dingell	Grant
Boggs	Dixon	Gray
Bonior	Donnelly	Green
Borski	Dorgan (ND)	Guarini
Bosco	Dornan (CA)	Gunderson
Boucher	Douglas	Hall (OH)
Boxer	Downey	Hall (TX)
Brennan	Dreier	Hamilton
Brooks	Duncan	Hammerschmidt
Broomfield	Durbin	Hancock
Browder	Dwyer	Hansen
Brown (CA)	Dymally	Harris
Brown (CO)	Dyson	Hastert
Bruce	Early	Hatcher
Buechner	Eckart	Hawkins
Bunning	Edwards (CA)	Hayes (IL)
Burton	Edwards (OK)	Hayes (LA)
Bustamante	Emerson	Hefley
Byron	Engel	Hefner
Callahan	English	Henry
Campbell (CA)	Erdreich	Herger
Campbell (CO)	Espy	Hertel
Cardin	Evans	Hiler
Carper	Fascell	Hoagland
Carr	Fawell	Hochbrueckner
Chandler	Fazio	Holloway
Clarke	Feighan	Hopkins

Horton	Molinari	Sensenbrenner
Houghton	Mollohan	Sharp
Hoyer	Montgomery	Shaw
Hubbard	Moody	Shays
Huckaby	Moorhead	Shumway
Hughes	Morella	Shuster
Hunter	Morrison (CT)	Sikorski
Hutto	Morrison (WA)	Sisisky
Hyde	Mrazek	Skaggs
Inhofe	Murphy	Skeen
Ireland	Murtha	Skelton
Jacobs	Myers	Slattery
James	Nagle	Slaughter (NY)
Jenkins	Natcher	Slaughter (VA)
Johnson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Smith (FL)
Johnson (SD)	Neal (NC)	Smith (MS)
Johnston	Nelson	Smith (NE)
Jones (GA)	Nielson	Smith (NJ)
Jones (NC)	Nowak	Smith (TX)
Jontz	Oakar	Smith (VT)
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Smith, Denny (OR)
Kasich	Obey	
Kastenmeier	Olin	Smith, Robert (NH)
Kennedy	Ortiz	
Kennelly	Owens (NY)	Smith, Robert (OR)
Kildee	Owens (UT)	
Kleczka	Packard	Snowe
Kolbe	Pallone	Solarz
Kolter	Panetta	Solomon
Kostmayer	Parker	Spence
Kyl	Parris	Spratt
LaFalce	Pashayan	Staggers
Lagomarsino	Patterson	Stallings
Lancaster	Paxon	Stangeland
Lantos	Payne (NJ)	Stark
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Leach (IA)	Pease	Stenholm
Leath (TX)	Pelosi	Stokes
Lehman (CA)	Penny	Studds
Lehman (FL)	Perkins	Stump
Leland	Petri	Sundquist
Lent	Pickett	Swift
Levin (MI)	Pickle	Synar
Levine (CA)	Porter	Tallon
Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Tanner
Lewis (FL)	Price	Tauke
Lewis (GA)	Pursell	Tauzin
Lightfoot	Quillen	Thomas (CA)
Lipinski	Rahall	Thomas (GA)
Livingston	Rangel	Thomas (WY)
Lloyd	Ravenel	Torres
Long	Ray	Torricelli
Lowery (CA)	Regula	Towns
Lowey (NY)	Rhodes	Traficant
Luken, Thomas	Richardson	Traxler
Lukens, Donald	Ridge	Udall
Machtley	Rinaldo	Unsoeld
Madigan	Ritter	Upton
Manton	Roberts	Valentine
Markey	Robinson	Vander Jagt
Marlenee	Roe	Vento
Martin (IL)	Rogers	Visclosky
Martin (NY)	Rohrabacher	Volkmer
Martinez	Rose	Vucanovich
Matsui	Rostenkowski	Walgren
Mavroules	Roth	Walker
Mazzoli	Roukema	Walsh
McCandless	Rowland (CT)	Waxman
McCloskey	Rowland (GA)	Weber
McCollum	Roybal	Weiss
McCrery	Russo	Weldon
McCurdy	Sabo	Wheat
McEwen	Saiki	Whittaker
McGrath	Sangmeister	Whitten
McHugh	Sarpalius	Williams
McMillan (NC)	Savage	Wise
McMillen (MD)	Sawyer	Wolf
McNulty	Saxton	Wolpe
Meyers	Schaefer	Wyden
Mfume	Scheuer	Wylie
Michel	Schiff	Yates
Miller (CA)	Schneider	Yatron
Miller (OH)	Schroeder	Young (AK)
Miller (WA)	Schuette	Young (FL)
Mineta	Schulze	
Moakley	Schumer	

NOES—0

NOT VOTING—14

Bentley	Florio	Smith (IA)
Bryant	Kaptur	Watkins
Chapman	McDade	Wilson
Collins	McDermott	Wright
Courter	Oxley	

□ 1259

Mr. HEFLEY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the en bloc amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1300

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NAGLE). Are there other amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTH: Page 517, beginning in line 10, strike out ", including voluntary debt reduction programs under appropriate circumstances,"; beginning in line 19, strike out "and alleviate its debt service"; page 518, beginning in line 4, strike out ", including voluntary debt reduction programs,"; page 519, line 11, strike out ", and voluntary debt reduction programs,"; beginning in line 13, strike out "export growth and diversification,"; beginning in line 18, strike out "including promoting greater participation of the United States private sector in the development of the Philippines"; line 23, before the period insert ", except that assistance under this chapter may not include support for voluntary debt reduction programs"; and page 522, beginning in line 5, strike out ", and voluntary debt reduction programs,".

Page 521, strike out lines 2 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

$200,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1991.

"(b) USE OF SPECIAL AUTHORITIES PROHIBITED.—The authorities of sections 4101, 4102, and 4103 may not be used to make funds available for use under this chapter. The references to this chapter in sections 4102 and 4103 shall not be construed to supersede the limitation contained in the preceding sentence.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, today I am asking you to vote for the people who voted for you, the American taxpayer.

My amendment promotes democracy in the Philippines, and it leaves intact all the millions and millions and millions of dollars that this Congress is determined to give to the Philippines. But when you look at this bill, you will find chapter 2 of title 9 provides for something called the multilateral assistance initiative, and this would give more money to the Philippines than I believe is prudent or right.

Now this is not a frivolous amendment. The amendment deals with $1 billion, and if the Members of this body are concerned about waste and excessive burdens on our taxpayers, ask them to review this MAI legislation.

I must admit that the chairman, who drafted this legislation, my good friend from New York, is a master at legislative drafting. This thing has four tripwires before you get to the heart of it. But when you get there, what you find is that above and beyond all the money we are already giving, we are going to give an additional $1 billion. Now that is too much, I would think, for most Members of this body to swallow.

It should be enough, even for the dedicated foreign aid enthusiasts who want to give more and more.

The existing legislation authorizes $200 million for the first year of the MAI Program and $800 million for the following 4 years. My amendment cuts back the authorization to $200 million this year and $200 million next year, saving the American taxpayer $600 million. At the same time, the Philippines will still receive the administration's requested AID levels for fiscal years 1990-91.

Between 1983 and 1989 we have given over $2 billion to the Philippines. And next year we are doubling, over this year, what we are giving to the Philippines. This Congress is shoveling more money out of the back door than the hard-working taxpayer can bring in the front door. What my amendment is basically saying is let us save the taxpayers some $600 million.

The Philippine people are a nice people, and we want to be their friends and we are. But the American taxpayer has to be considered at some point too.

Now what I find a little amazing are the reasons some people are voting against this amendment.

Although the MAI will cost taxpayers an additional $1 billion over everything else we are giving, I heard one of the Members say, "Well, I have a lot of Filipinos in my district." Filipinos are nice people, but do you not have a lot of taxpayers too? And aren't the Filipinos in his district taxpayers as well?

Here's another reason, which appears in a crib sheet that is being sent around. It says, "Secretary Baker is going to personally go to the Far East on July 4," and needs this $1 billion authorization to be effective.

Now all of us here are concerned about junkets, but the Secretary of State has to have $1 billion to go to the Far East? Come on.

The Secretary of the Treasury says the MAI is important because it is going to help the Philippines pay off their national debt. Well, how about our own debt? We have got a national debt of $2.8 trillion. We are wringing our hands and our shirts to try to get our deficit this year down to $100 billion. Should we then turn right

around and add another billion dollars in foreign aid?

Here is another reason to vote against my amendment according to the cribsheet that's making the rounds: The Administration is now seeking a top-flight experienced statesman as a U.S. special representative to insure that the MAI works.

Think about it. This is a reason to vote against my amendment? Because we are trying to find somebody who is going to do a good job with this program? Well, there are a few people down at HUD who might take this job, because it will probably turn out to be the same kind of a program.

Under the existing legislation the Philippines will become the third largest recipient of foreign aid from the United States. And did you know that apart from our aid, the U.S. military presence in the Philippines contributes $500 million every year to the Philippine economy?

The U.S. Government employs some 68,000 Filipinos, the second largest employer in the Philippines. I mean how much more can we do?

The Philippines are awash in U.S. taxpayer dollars. There are $238 million in United States foreign aid committed to the Philippines that Manila cannot spend fast enough.

And listen to this: There is $4 billion in the pipeline from worldwide sources of foreign aid that has not yet been spent. Yet some of us are going to come in here and milk the taxpayer the way a dairy farmer in Wisconsin milks a dairy cow. It is just not fair.

This Congress is going to borrow another billion dollars and ship it overseas at the same time that we are cutting back on Medicare, we are cutting back on veterans health care, we are cutting back on farmers.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I will yield the gentleman additional time. But before I do that, I want to say that in all honesty I oppose the amendment, although many of the points the gentleman from Wisconsin makes are valid and very compelling, that at this stage in the process to adopt this amendment probably would have an adverse effect on the negotiations going on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, at the same time we are going to transfer an additional $1 billion overseas we are cutting back on Medicare. Yesterday they cut back by $2 billion, for our own people.

Today we are going to add an additional $1 billion that we are shipping overseas.

Veterans health care is cut back, SDI is cut back, farmers are cut back, the drug program is cut back; everything domestically is being cut back. It is just not fair, it is not right. It is not fair to the American people for us to be doing that to them.

The Philippines are getting a ton of money, more money than they can utilize, and at the same time we are facing unprecedented national deficits.

You all know we are fighting to get this deficit down to $100 billion. We have an unbelievable national debt of $2.8 trillion.

□ 1310

Every one of the Members I bet will go back home and say we have to balance the budget. Well, how can Members do that? How can they go back home and tell their people we have huge deficits, and then come in here and spend an extra billion dollars in addition to the high levels in bilateral aid we're already giving. It is not fair to the people the Members represent. It is just not fair for Members to throw more taxpayer dollars to governments that, quite frankly, are ungrateful. The day will come when we rue this action.

I think it is about time we made some changes. I ask Members to take a look at this amendment. Do not spend a billion dollars. We should be cutting all of it out. My amendment is a reasonable compromise. It says $200 million this year, $200 million next year. Let Members see how this program moves along.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to voice my same concerns as my friend from California did about the negotiating process, about the fact that the Philippines certainly is another extraordinarily fragile democracy, and we have a tremendous vested interest in that entire part of the world, and specifically, the Philippines. However, nevertheless, it seems that the amendment that the gentleman is offering is extraordinarily balanced and that it simply says that rather than having a full 5-year package of $1 billion, what we are doing is we are having an opportunity to relook at the issue, after 2 years, and $400 million is expended.

I think in light of that, it is a very reasonable compromise as we deal with a very delicate issue. I support the gentleman in his amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution very much, and I want to reiterate again that we are not touching the millions and millions and millions of dollars going to the Philippines. In fact, this aid is going to be double next year. We are not touching it. However, there is a provision in this bill that says we are going to get $1 billion of new money, and I am saying that is just too much. That is why I am cutting it back.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming the balance of my time, I would like to repeat, in spite of my great respect and admiration for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], I oppose his amendment.

I think with the debate we had about what is happening in China and what is going on in that part of the world, now is not the time to be interfering with this arrangement that has been made and reached with other countries in the region.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Philippines multilateral aid initiative [MAI] as presently written in H.R. 2655 and in opposition to the amendments offered by Mr. ROTH of Wisconsin which will seriously undermine the benefits of the MAI and diminish its chances of success.

I strongly believe that the multilateral aid initiative is a creative and constructive program that will signficantly help shore up the Philippines' economy and thereby its democracy all at a relatively modest cost to the United States.

One of the most serious problems facing democracy in the Philippines today is inadequate economic growth and continuing poverty. Economic problems and the great disparity between rich and poor provide fertile breeding ground for Communist propaganda and inroads. The benefits from the MAI will certainly counter the appeals from the antidemocratic Communists, like the new people's army.

The Philippines is a very important strategic ally of the United States. The ties between the Filipino and American people are long and strong. We have fought together and died together for freedom and liberty. If democracy were to fail in the Philippines, it would have major negative repercussions throughout Asia's other fledgling democracies and the world. The future of our bases at Subic Bay and Clark Air Force Base would be jeopardized. These strategically located bases are a critical part of our national defense strategy and security in the Western Pacific and Indian Oceans. They would be extremely difficult to replace and only at great cost and loss of some present capabilities. I agree with my colleagues that our aid program to the Philippines is one of the largest. However, the Philippines is also one of our most important allies and closest friends.

The MAI is a multiyear, multinational public and private aid plan for the Philippines that would provide the capital, investment, and infrastructure necessary to bolster the Philippines economy. Directly linked to MAI assistance is economic policy reform in the Philippines such as deregulation of interisland shipping and strengthening of rural financial markets. In fact, the MAI has already paid divi-

dends by provoking bureaucratic shake-ups in the Philippines and instituting policies more supportive of private sector and free market growth.

Other uses of the MAI will be for: First, infrastructure—today, inadequate infrastructure—roads, communication facilities, energy resources—is a major obstacle to private sector growth; second, natural resource management to ensure environmentally and ecologically sound development; and third, support for investment in key economic development zones like southern Mindanao. This would include infrastructure and local market improvements.

As currently envisioned, the Philippines would receive $2 billion a year for the next 5 years in additional resources under the MAI. This would be in addition to the aid it is presently receiving from the international donor community including the United States. At least one-half of the $10 billion, at the rate of $1 billion per year, would be provided by the public sector—foreign governments including Japan, numerous European nations, ASEAN countries, and the multilateral development banks. The private sector will contribute the other $5 billion in the form of new investments, debt equity swaps, and other initiatives.

The U.S. Government, through our foreign aid appropriations, will contribute $1 billion over the next 5 years. Only $200 million is authorized to be spent in fiscal year 1990. This is special MAI funding above and beyond the regular $481 million requested for fiscal year 1990 and fiscal year 1991. Before any MAI funds can actually be obligated, the congressional committees of jurisdiction must be notified in advance and can block any amount or use of funds by invoking reprogramming type procedures set forth in this authorizing legislation. Clearly, there are tight controls on the program to ensure that American tax dollars are being properly and efficiently used.

It is important to note that nine-tenths of the MAI's funding does not come from U.S. foreign aid. Other economic powers like Japan, Europe, and ASEAN nations must share the burden. In fact, this legislation specifically prevents the release of the $200 million until the President determines that a "substantial majority" of the resources for the program have been provided by other countries.

As detailed in the "Dear Colleague" letter I signed along with Chairmen FASCELL and SOLARZ, and the ranking Republican Member of the Asia Subcommittee JIM LEACH, many of the arguments against the MAI are either misleading or better categorized as arguments against any major foreign aid program. The Roth amendments limit the U.S. commitment to the MAI to 2 years, raising legitimate concerns among Filipinos and the international donor community about the seriousness of our commitment. While other foreign donors will contribute four times more official assistance than we will, they look to the United States for leadership. A significant cut in our participation, as Mr. ROTH's proposal to slash $600 million does, undermines the incentive for others to increase their own assistance levels to the Philippines.

The Roth amendments would preclude using MAI funds for promoting greater United States private sector participation in the development of the Philippines. This is self-defeating as it undermines the opportunities for U.S. businesses and instead directs the growing Filipino market toward non-American investments and non-American goods and services. It is known that when we promote development in the Third World, these countries in turn become markets for U.S. products providing us with far greater returns on our investments. That helps, not hurts, American jobs and prosperity.

The bottom line is the Philippines needs substantial economic help today. The Communist threat taking advantage of current economic difficulties is real and will continue to grow. The price of ignoring this need is too high. The MAI is an innovative, cost-effective way to provide the Philippines with the infusion of economic resources and reforms it needs to build a sound economic foundation upon which democracy, positive social change, and growth can flourish.

The MAI is strongly endorsed by President Bush and has wide bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. The MAI can work and can become a model of success if it is provided with the resources and flexibility needed to meet the many challenges of the Filipino economic environment. The present version of the MAI provides such ability, the Roth amendments do not.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the positive, worthy MAI program as presented in H.R. 2655 and oppose the Roth amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to start out by commending the tenacity and the effort of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH]. I believe he is right.

In fact, I am sitting here, I am really frosted! We have been talking for weeks now about more and more money and how we are going to send it overseas, and the strategic importance of that money. I am not going to question the brilliance and wisdom of our committee. We have a great chairman, Mr. FASCELL. Although when we talk about foreign aid, Members part ways with me.

Now we know in 1986, Corazon Aquino came over here, and most of the Members in the House wore something yellow. They had jackets, some even had pants, some had flowers of yellow and everybody was so excited about Corazon Aquino. I think she is a great lady and God bless her, but she had already received a half a billion dollars, $500 million from the taxpayers of Uncle Sam that year, and she was back to meet with President Reagan, she needed another supplemental appropriation of $200 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, she made a speech here that now must be a record in American history, in the history of Congress. She got the biggest honorarium in the history of the United States of America. She got, I do not know, was it $200 million for a 30-minute speech or was it $100 million, when it was finally settled?

The point I am trying to make is we have water lines falling apart in New York. We have kids graduating from high school that cannot read. We have bridges in Pennsylvania and Ohio collapsing, killing people. We have people without jobs. We have factories moving overseas. America is in trouble. No one wants to listen. Well, I was one of the few in 1986 that said, "Mrs. Aquino, I think you got too much money then," and I tell you what, Mr. ROTH, you are right on. I think it is time somebody gets a hold of Congress and starts talking about a dire emergency program for America.

Now I am against this turkey. They have already received billions of dollars from America, and this would provide one more billion. Let me tell the Members the facts of it. Where is the commitment on the two bases? There is no agreement. The foreign minister over there, Mr. Manglapus, let me tell you what he said. In March 1988, he said, "America will have to pay billions of dollars if they want to keep those bases, because they are nothing more than a colonial power in our own homeland." Their foreign minister said if they "did not come up with the bucks, throw them out. We do not really want them anyway."

Now, we are going to finance their export of products to America? My people are being laid off. Hey, someone said yesterday, I believe it was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said, "Enough is enough." And I will say to Members, he is right. Mr. ROTH is right. When are we going to stop this giveaway? My people need some help.

Who is listening about the people in Youngstown, OH? Who really cares? Who is talking about people in Brooklyn, Philadelphia? Los Angeles? Go ahead and smile, we are beginning to take a fly in our face and make it big enough where it is becoming an elephant that will eat the assets of Congress.

I am for the Roth amendment. I commend him and later on in this great debate Members will have an opportunity to help with the deficit of the United States of America to cut $1.12 billion from this giveaway program. If no one is listening, they should be. Support the Roth amendment.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. Let me try to put this in perspective for the Members of the House. We do, after all, have before us an amendment which would effectively gut one of the most important foreign policy initiatives of the Bush administration be reducing by 60 percent the authorized and requested level funding for the multilateral aid initiative for the Philippines.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, my very good friend [Mr. ROTH], the author of the amendment, has complained about the extent to which we would be providing a billion additional dollars to the Philippines. What he neglects to mention is the fact that this is a 5-year authorization in which we would be providing $200 million a year in additional assistance to the Philippines for 5 years rather than $1 billion in 1 year, all at once.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] has also neglected to point out the fact that the overall level of funding in this bill before Members, which includes the full authorization for the MAI is within the budget resolution, and the President's foreign aid request. Furthermore, may I say to my very good friend from Wisconsin who appears concerned about what we might do a few years from now, that all we have before Members now is an authorization. It does not provide for an appropriation. The Committee on Appropriations and then the Congress as a whole is going to have to appropriate the money. If we come to the conclusion that it is not being wisely spent, or it is not being well spent, or it is not being productively spent, we do not have to appropriate the money. There will be hearings by the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but the Congress could really retain control over this.

Furthermore, we have provided in the authorizing legislation that before any of the money can be spent, we have to be precisely notified what it will be spent for, so we have some additional control over it.

However, most importantly, what I think needs to be said is that this is not a unilateral American initiative. We are not just putting 1 billion additional dollars in the Philippines over 5 years by ourselves. This is part of a multilateral aid initiative which will include the participation of the European countries, of Japan, of several other Asian countries as well, in addition to the Asian Development Bank and other international financial institutions. My friend from Wisconsin and other Members of the House frequently complain very bitterly, about the unwillingness of third countries to share their proper part of the burden of our collective security. This multilateral initiative is a response to those concerns on burden sharing.

□ 1320

It is premised on the notion that while we have a significant stake in the survival of democracy in the Philippines and in preventing the triumph of Communist guerrillas in that country, we are not the only ones. So do other countries. Consequently, a limited amount of American assistance will be used to leverage a much greater amount of assistance from Japan, from the European countries, from the international financial institutions, and from other Asian countries as well.

If this amendment were to be adopted, cutting by 60 percent the authorized level of aid for the Philippines and the multilateral aid initiative for the next 5 years, it would pull the rug out from under our efforts to get other countries to increase their contributions to the Philippines. And indeed there could not be a worse time for this amendment to be considered and adopted than right now.

Next week Secretary of State Baker is making a special trip to Tokyo to represent the United States in a pledging conference designed to get the multilateral aid initiative to the Philippines off the ground. At that time all these other countries and international financial institutions will be asked to significantly increase the level of their aid to the Philippines. If the House of Representatives votes for the Roth amendment, cutting by 60 percent the level of aid requested by the administration, Secretary of State Baker will be humiliated before all the other countries that are there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, very much for yielding.

So, Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted now, it will embarrass and humiliate the Secretary of State and probably result in a dramatic reduction in the level of contributions made by the other countries who will say to Secretary Baker: "Why should we give more when the Congress is voting to give less?"

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we have just voted unanimously to condemn the suppression of democracy in China and to impose sanctions on the People's Republic of China because of the crackdown on the pro-democracy movement in that country. We now have an opportunity to decide whether we are going to support or walk away from democracy in the Philippines.

A lot of progress has been made by Mrs. Aquino in the last few years, ever since the triumph of people power in the Philippines.

But they face enormous problems. They have a $28 billion foreign debt, and they have a population where 60 percent of the people live below the poverty line. They have an entrenched Communist insurgency which still has the capacity to one day seize power in the Philippines. And if democracy were to fail in that country, it would be a serious strategic setback to the United States and a blow to the hopes and aspirations of hundreds of millions of people around the world who are encrouaged by the peaceful emergence of democracy in the Philippines.

In the final analysis, the survival of democracy in the Philippines will depend on Mrs. Aquino's ability to translate the promise of pluralism into a better life for the Filipino people. And this is given our enormous stake in the survival of democracy in the Philippines and the spread of democracy elsewhere. And may I say that if democracy fails in the Philippines, the chances are that our bases will go out there, because I rather doubt under those circumstances that we would be able to maintain our most important military facilities anywhere in the world outside of the continental United States.

So, Mr. Chairman, for all those reasons, if Members believe in demcoracy, if Members believe that we have a responsibility to support democracy, if Members believe in burden-sharing, if Members believe in supporting one of the most important foreign policy initiatives of the administration, I urge them to vote against the amendment that is now before us.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I would say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] has laid out the evidence as to why the well-intentioned amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], makes no sense. But I think if we just look back at the loss of life by American servicemen and women in our attempt to establish democracy in Southeast Asia, we would realize that the cost here is a pittance compared to the tens of thousands of Americans who fell in an attempt to have democracy exist in Vietnam. But

here the Filipino people on their own are fighting for democracy.

I think the most important point the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] made is that there is a direct link with the economic situation of the people and the viability of a democratic government. If we pull the rug out from the Philippines as we know it since Mrs. Acquino took power, a country that is striving for democracy at a time when democratic institutions are so fragile, let us hope that we are not the ones here on the floor trying to put the pieces together if the Philippines fall apart.

So I would hope that while this seems to be an easy vote over the long-term, it is a very dangerous vote and a very costly vote. The Philippines buy close to $2 billion of products from the United States, and when we add services to that, the figure will clearly exceed several billions of dollars. It is an important market for the United States. If the economy of the Philippines improves, it will be a greater market for American goods.

So I would hope that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs would be listened to, and that my friends on the other side of this issue—and this is not a partisan issue—would rethink their position, because we ought not be in a position where we have to send troops to defend democracy in the Philippines. This is a far less expensive approach.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] a couple of questions, but before I do, I want to preface my question by stating that I do not think the Philippine Islands have any better friends in the world than the United States. A lot of Americans died in the Philippine Islands to preserve democracy and freedom. A lot of Americans lost their limbs over there and fought over there.

While I have not been wounded, I was one who made the invasion at Lingayen Gulf against the Japanese on January 5, 1945. I spent a year and a half there. I have a great and abiding affection for the Filipino people.

But I am concerned that we must pay $435 million a year for those bases that we occupy there, and they want even more money. Those bases not only protect the Philippines, which we have a history of protecting with our blood, but they provide work and employment for thousands of Filipinos who otherwise might be trying to cut sugarcane while they have no place to export it.

So I do not think we as Americans have anything to apologize about in our relationship with and our support of the Philippines and democracy in the Philippines. And I must say that it is more than a little reassuring to hear the solicitude for democracy in the abstract argued for and advanced by some of the most articulate and liberal spokesmen in this body. The argument is for democracy in the Philippines and democracy in a lot of other places. I only wish their solicitude was not quite as selective, because I would like to hear the same commitment to democracy in Nicaragua, which is not very far from the Texas border.

Nonetheless, I do have some questions, and I would like to ask my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], who has supplanted General MacArthur in terms of being a national hero to the Philippines, a few questions.

But I will ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] does he believe that the best way to protect democracy and to keep the friendship of the Philippine people, is to send more billions over there? And I mean billions, because when we add it all up we are talking billions.

How do we get a commitment from them to reciprocate and say:

> Hey, we're your friends, too. We like your bases. We like Clark Field. It protects us. It protects Western civilization. We like Subic Bay. We like the base there. It provides employment for our people.

How do we elicit some gratitude? I know that is a naive hope in the world of diplomacy, because everyone asks: "What have you done for me lately?" But we have done a lot for the Philippines.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorely tempted to support the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] simply because perhaps a move in the other direction will get a little more sympathetic understanding for us from the Philippines.

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

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

□ 1330

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] for asking the question. It is a serious question. It is an entirely legitimate question.

I might begin by saying that in general one catches more flies with honey than with vinegar. I can say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], my friend, that I was in the Philippines in April. I met with President Aquino. She made it clear that she hopes negotiations on the renewal of the base agreement will commence before the end of the year. I am very hopeful that we will be able to successfully conclude a new base agreement with the Philippines.

Mr. HYDE. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], "Don't we pay enough? Should we pay more millions?"

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we could avoid having to pay any more than we are now. I believe, as does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] that the bases serve the interests of both of our countries.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] of one thing. There is enormous good will for the United States and the Philippines. There are some noisy people who make a profession of criticizing our country. We know they are there, as there are elsewhere in the world. But when one goes out into the countryside, the great majority of the people are friendly to the United States.

I have been told by no less authority than His Eminence, Cardinal Sin; that, if they had a referendum in the Philippines on whether or not to continue the bases, 85 percent of the people would probably vote to continue having the bases there—precisely for the reasons mentioned by the gentleman, that they do contribute to the security and the economic well-being of the Philippines.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] indicated that he will get more flies with honey than he will with vinegar. Well, that is true most of the time, but I do not believe it is true in the area of foreign aid because, if my colleagues look at the foreign aid figures around the world, the countries we give an awful lot of money to seem to vote against us about 95 percent of the time at the United Nations, so I am not so sure that one really will get more flies with honey than they do with vinegar. So, maybe we need to send a message.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to go through some of the remarks the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] made and try to answer them. He said this money is going to be spread over 5 years. The fact of the matter is it is $200 billion the first year, and $800 billion the second year, which can be spread over 4 years, and I submit to my colleagues that it is likely to be all spent the second year. Yes, this must be appropriated, but we want to kick it off track now before it gets to the appropriation process. We are cutting foreign aid all over the world, and yet right now we are going to give an additional $1 billion to the Philippines?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not affect military aid we are giving to the Philippines or any other economic aid. But it will cut the additional $1 billion down to $400 million.

My colleagues, one of the things that should be brought up in this debate is the attitude the Philippine Government has toward the United States. Do my colleagues know that they are not even taking care of our military cemeteries over there, or our monuments? That shows a disrespect

for this country at a time we are trying to help them, and I think that message needs to get through to the Philippine Government loud and clear.

Now let us take a look at the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] really quickly. It is going to be used, $1 billion in United States taxpayer funds will go for payments of Philippine debts at a time when we have a huge debt in this country. I would like to read just a little bit from the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH]. He says:

> But, if you agree with me that it is wrong for us to ship another billion dollars to the Philippines while we cut Medicare, SDI and the super collider, underfund veterans health care and the antidrug program, and then sneak through more taxes, then vote for the Roth amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think most people would agree. It is wrong to cut those programs and send a billion dollars to another country so that can pay their debts. We have debts of our own.

He also says in this statement:

> But did they tell you that the Philippines have a $4 billion backlog of aid from sources around the world?

Now get that, a $4 billion backlog in aid from around the world including $200 million from us? It is just sitting there.

The truth is they have so much aid in the pipeline that it will take them 14 years to draw it down according to our own Government estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] makes a lot of sense. I think we ought to support it. We are trying to cut spending in this country. Here is a perfect area in which to do it, and the American taxpayers, I believe, will go right along with it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was not even going to speak on this amendment until our good friend, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] took the well and started again pontificating the way he does when he blocks all of our amendments, on this side of the aisle, concerning Nicaragua. So, maybe he needs a taste of his own medicine.

So, let me just say that 40 years ago, Everett Dirksen used to say on this floor: "You know, a million dollars here, a million there. Soon you're talking about real money."

When I came to this Congress over a decade ago, we had other people over here saying, "A hundred million dollars here, a hundred million dollars there; we're talking real money."

Now today: "A billion dollars here, a billion dollars there; now we're talking real money."

Mr. Chairman, I never saw money go out the window so fast in all my life.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], our acting Secretary of State, took the floor and gave the best argument I have heard all day for the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], because he said, "Mr. ROTH, we're not talking about a billion dollars this year. We're talking about a billion dollars over 5 years." Yes, and it all can be spent in 2 years.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], my good friend, and all of those good people know that therein lies the problem. We have turned this foreign aid bill into an entitlement program, and God knows we have enough problems now with entitlement programs in this country which are bankrupting the coffers.

Mr. Chairman, it would not be so bad if Mrs. Aquino and the Philippine Government were at least taking care of our monuments in the Philippines. Has anybody been there and seen where MacArthur landed when he saved the bacon of those Philippine people? These sites are going down the drain, and we are having to spend our own taxpayers' dollars to repair and maintain the monuments.

Mr. Chairman, this world is upside down. We should not be giving anybody 2 years' worth of aid.

Let us have 1-year foreign aid bills so we can hold people accountable. That is what we need to do in this Congress, and then we would be successful. Then we would have bilateral agreements with these countries. When they come hat in hand, at least they would not be bad-mouthing us at the United Nations every day and having their hand out here to take our money.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to pass the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH]. It is the smartest thing we can do today.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the multi-lateral assistance initiative, as reported by the Committee, sends an additional $1 billion to the Philippines when there is already $4 billion allocated to this country which has not been spent. In fact, there is so much Philippine foreign aid already in the pipeline, our own A.I.D. mission estimates that it may take as many as 14 years to use it up. That estimate comes from our own A.I.D. mission.

President Reagan, whom I served in the White House, can count it as one of his proudest accomplishments that America assisted in the democratic transfer of power in the Philippines. And President Bush is absolutely right to count the Philippines among our most important strategic allies. The bases at Subic and Clark are vital to American power in the Pacific. That's why I support 100 percent of the provisions of military aid to the Philippines—and the Roth amendment leaves all such vital assistance intact.

What we must oppose, Mr. Chairman, is the outright government subsidy of Philippine business and Philippine debts contained in the foreign aid bill. It would make no sense for the American taxpayer to spread around government largesse of this kind to American business; it makes even less sense to put foreign business on the dole. We have a national debt of over $2 trillion. We will have a budget deficit for the upcoming fiscal year of almost $100 billion more—that is, if we're lucky.

I'm one who believes that if governments would just get out of the way, American industry can be competitive with industry anywhere in the world. That's why I oppose government subsidies at home, and protectionist trade barriers abroad. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, we can all agree it makes no sense to subsidize our foreign competition—but that is exactly what we would be doing with this foreign assistance bill, unless we pass the Roth amendment.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, the United States has generously provided its friends—and sometimes those who we can only hope might become our friends—hundreds of billions of dollars in foreign aid. And yet, if we look at the results, there is anything but a 1-to-1 correspondence between foreign aid recipients, and countries which have managed to improve their economy and become self-sufficient. Instead, it is those countries that have relied to a large extent on encouraging private investment who have succeeded in turning around their economies.

When it comes to foreign assistance, Mr. Chairman, we have got to consider the possibility that countries receiving U.S. aid in abundance may in fact be less likely to reach economic self-sufficiency—and that our foreign aid may be keeping such countries in a state of dependency.

In fact, as I read the Hamilton Report, prepared by the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Woods Report, prepared by the Agency for International Development, that is exactly what I find likely to be the case with this proposed $1 billion of additional foreign aid to the Philippines.

A few years ago, I traveled to the Philippines with my father—who fought side-by-side with the Filipinos in World War II—and revisited with him the battle ruins on Corregidor where the cries of brave, dying American and allied soldiers still echo in the barracks. I learned there that there is a profound bond between the American people and the Filipinos. We ought to be proud to count the people of the Philippines as friends. We must

be steadfast in our support for their democracy.

But Mr. Chairman, we musn't confuse friendship and support for democracy with wasteful government subsidies of Philippine debts, exports, and business investments. This extra $1 billion for the Philippines is one of the best examples why we have a huge budget deficit in this country. And that, Mr. Chairman, is why I support the Roth amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support his amendment, to reduce this $1 billion to $400 million, and to deliver on the promise we have all made to our constituents—to work to cut our own massive budget deficit.

□ 1340

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

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

First of all, this is an administration request. I know that does not mean too much to some of the people over there, but it is an important request.

Second, it is part of, as the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, an international effort to help preserve an ally that is important to us in a national security sense, an economic sense and a political sense.

We have made this commitment over a long period of time and it should not be disbanded lightly.

Now, the argument I have heard sounds something like this: The United States really has no need for the Philippines. I mean, after all, the bases are just as much for them as they are for us, so if we lose them, we will do something else. I said the argument sounds like this to me. Maybe I do not hear too good.

Also, it sounded to me like, well, the United States has not really much place here with regard to this because we are spending too much money, anyway.

I just want to remind my colleagues that aside from the fact that this is an administration request within an overall policy concept as they see it, with which our committee agreed when we brought this bill to the floor, it is also within the budget agreement.

So I can understand, having been raised on a farm, having been a farm boy and also a city boy, I understand exactly how the gentleman from Wisconsin feels about his farmers and how the gentleman from Ohio feels about his urban people, because I have had the experience of representing both. I know the feeling, but that is not to say that the United States and the people in the United States do not likewise have real national security interests which are vital to farmers and city people and other people in this country.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. Not now, I say to the gentleman, later. As soon as I get a chance to finish the statement, I will be glad to have the gentleman ask me whatever he wants to ask me.

I know that the feeling is strong about trying to knockout these 2 years on this particular amount of money for the Philippines on the theory that we have so many domestic needs that perhaps something else ought to be done. That discussion is a valid discussion. It can be made on every bill on this floor, and I dare say I heard somebody in the debate say that that is exactly what they plan to do, and I suppose we will go through that.

It would seem to me after all the struggle we have had in this Congress with regard to an overall approach to the budget with the administration that once we got that agreement, we should do our best to sustain it.

So here we have legitimate international interests, national security, economic and political. Despite all our needs in this country, we cannot walk away from our responsibility in the world. We just cannot get off the planet and act like the rest of the world does not exist or that the United States does not have problems in this world and that what happens out there in the rest of the world affects every single American citizen.

The total amount of money that is spent on the American taxpayer's bill for the entire foreign aid program relative to the entire Federal budget might as well be less than 4 cents a person. You cannot even buy a single cigarette for that much money, and we are buying economic improvement, national security, humanitarian aid, political assistance, all around the world for our country, and yet we find people who simply want to because they have real needs here that need to be addressed, want to take it out of this package, when we have an overall balance which the Congress and this administration have agreed to and we have brought the House the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues not to vent their wrath on this amendment, and that was not intended to be a pun.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is what I was afraid of.

Mr. FASCELL. We will get some more time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I came into this debate and was listening to it, and I had several questions. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] has supplied me with the answers to these questions.

Looking at this, I rise in support of the Roth amendment. It appears to me that in 1989 we supplied $311 million of aid to the Philippines under the budget. In 1990, what is proposed even under the Roth amendment is $481 million, plus $200 million in multilateral aid, so that brings it to $681 million.

So I say to my colleagues here in the House that we are increasing it from the 1989 budget of $311 million with the multilateral aid up to $681 million; so by anyone's calculation, we are increasing it twice. It is an awful lot of money increase, even with the Roth amendment.

So I think at this point it is clear that we are being very aggressive under this proposal.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to make a couple points to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for whom I have the highest respect.

If you put 4 cents per person for everybody in this country, you sure do not come up with $11 billion, so I do not know where the gentleman came up with that figure, but I have great respect for the chairman of the committee.

The other thing I would like to point out is that the gentleman talked about national security interests, and I agree that the Philippines play a very important role in our national security program. That is why I wanted to ask, have they given any commitment that they are going to let us keep Clark Air Base or Subic Bay? Because nobody in this body knows if we can keep those bases there.

□ 1350

They keep using those bases to get more money out of us, and it is in our national-security interest, but there has been no commitment, and we need to get that commitment from them posthaste.

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

Mr. STEARNS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I will just comment that I think the gentleman has been sending his message for the last 30 minutes. I think the message was received. I hope it is helpful.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, the multilateral assistance initiative [MAI] is an American-initiated international effort to provide the government of Corazon Aquino and the people of the Philippines sufficient resources to address their dire economic problems.

While the U.S. commitment of $200 million a year to the MAI will be only one-fifth the project total and not the largest contribution, American leadership on this matter is basic to its success and of critical importance.

We should seriously consider the timing of this important matter. The major donor nations to the MAI will be meeting from July 3 through 5 in Tokyo to coordinate their effort and to pledge their support to the Philippines and the MAI. A reduction in the American commitment from the $200 million level or a 5-year assessment would be interpreted by the world as U.S. repudiation of the MAI. Such a signal at this time could likely undermine the entire initiative.

The Aquino government is saddled with a $29 billion debt and an annual debt service of approximately $3.1 billion. In each year since 1986, the Philippines has paid over $1 billion in debt service to foreign creditors than it receives in assistance.

In a country where nearly 70 percent of the population lives in poverty and per capita income is less than $2 a day, the net transfer of capital out of the country is a significant impediment to sustained economic recovery.

The Roth amendment limits the U.S. commitment to the MAI to 2 years, instead of 5, and thus would raise serious concerns within the international donor community. Before sending such a signal, it should be considered that the international donor community will contribute four times more official assistance than will the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

AYES—185

Andrews	Darden	Hansen
Applegate	Davis	Harris
Archer	DeLay	Hastert
Armey	Derrick	Hatcher
Baker	DeWine	Hayes (IL)
Ballenger	Dickinson	Hayes (LA)
Barnard	Dornan (CA)	Hefley
Barton	Douglas	Hefner
Bateman	Dreier	Henry
Bereuter	Duncan	Herger
Bevill	Early	Hiler
Bilirakis	Emerson	Holloway
Bliley	English	Hopkins
Browder	Erdreich	Horton
Brown (CO)	Fawell	Hubbard
Buechner	Fields	Hughes
Bunning	Flippo	Hutto
Burton	Ford (MI)	Hyde
Callahan	Frenzel	Inhofe
Campbell (CO)	Gallegly	Ireland
Clement	Gaydos	Jacobs
Coble	Gekas	James
Coleman (MO)	Gibbons	Jenkins
Combest	Gingrich	Johnson (SD)
Conyers	Glickman	Jones (NC)
Cox	Goodling	Jontz
Craig	Grandy	Kanjorski
Crane	Hall (TX)	Kasich
Crockett	Hammerschmidt	Kleczka
Dannemeyer	Hancock	Kyl
Lent	Payne (VA)	Smith, Robert (NH)
Lewis (FL)	Perkins	Smith, Robert (OR)
Lightfoot	Petri	Solomon
Lloyd	Quillen	Spence
Lukens, Donald	Ravenel	Stallings
Marlenee	Rhodes	Stearns
Martin (IL)	Ridge	Stenholm
Martin (NY)	Ritter	Stump
Martinez	Roberts	Tallon
Mazzoli	Robinson	Tanner
McCandless	Rogers	Tauke
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
McCrery	Roth	Thomas (GA)
McDade	Roukema	Thomas (WY)
McEwen	Rowland (CT)	Traficant
McMillan (NC)	Rowland (GA)	Traxler
McNulty	Russo	Upton
Montgomery	Schaefer	Valentine
Moorhead	Schiff	Vander Jagt
Murphy	Schroeder	Volkmer
Myers	Schulze	Vucanovich
Neal (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Nelson	Sharp	Watkins
Nielson	Shaw	Weldon
Obey	Shumway	Whittaker
Ortiz	Shuster	Wylie
Oxley	Skeen	Yatron
Packard	Skelton	Young (AK)
Parker	Slattery	Young (FL)
Parris	Slaughter (VA)	
Pashayan	Smith (MS)	
Patterson	Smith (NE)	
Paxon	Smith, Denny (OR)	

NOES—233

Ackerman	Espy	Lewis (CA)
Akaka	Evans	Lewis (GA)
Alexander	Fascell	Lipinski
Anderson	Fazio	Livingston
Annunzio	Feighan	Long
Anthony	Fish	Lowery (CA)
Aspin	Flake	Lowey (NY)
Atkins	Foglietta	Luken, Thomas
AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Machtley
Bartlett	Frank	Madigan
Bates	Frost	Manton
Beilenson	Gallo	Markey
Bennett	Garcia	Matsui
Berman	Gejdenson	Mavroules
Bilbray	Gephardt	McCloskey
Boehlert	Gillmor	McCurdy
Boggs	Gilman	McGrath
Bonior	Gonzalez	McHugh
Borski	Gordon	McMillen (MD)
Bosco	Goss	Meyers
Boucher	Gradison	Mfume
Boxer	Grant	Michel
Brennan	Gray	Miller (CA)
Brooks	Green	Miller (OH)
Broomfield	Guarini	Miller (WA)
Brown (CA)	Gunderson	Mineta
Bruce	Hall (OH)	Moakley
Bustamante	Hamilton	Molinari
Byron	Hawkins	Mollohan
Campbell (CA)	Hertel	Moody
Cardin	Hoagland	Morella
Carper	Hochbrueckner	Morrison (CT)
Carr	Houghton	Morrison (WA)
Chandler	Hoyer	Mrazek
Clarke	Huckaby	Murtha
Clay	Hunter	Nagle
Clinger	Johnson (CT)	Natcher
Coleman (TX)	Johnston	Neal (MA)
Conte	Jones (GA)	Nowak
Cooper	Kaptur	Oakar
Costello	Kastenmeier	Oberstar
Coughlin	Kennedy	Olin
Coyne	Kennelly	Owens (NY)
DeFazio	Kildee	Owens (UT)
Dellums	Kolbe	Pallone
Dicks	Kolter	Panetta
Dingell	Kostmayer	Payne (NJ)
Dixon	LaFalce	Pease
Donnelly	Lagomarsino	Pelosi
Dorgan (ND)	Lancaster	Penny
Downey	Lantos	Pickett
Durbin	Laughlin	Pickle
Dwyer	Leach (IA)	Porter
Dymally	Leath (TX)	Poshard
Dyson	Lehman (CA)	Price
Eckart	Lehman (FL)	Pursell
Edwards (CA)	Leland	Rahall
Edwards (OK)	Levin (MI)	Rangel
Engel	Levine (CA)	Ray
Regula	Skaggs	Towns
Richardson	Slaughter (NY)	Udall
Rinaldo	Smith (FL)	Unsoeld
Roe	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Rose	Smith (VT)	Visclosky
Rostenkowski	Snowe	Walgren
Roybal	Solarz	Walsh
Saiki	Spratt	Waxman
Sangmeister	Staggers	Weber
Sarpalius	Stangeland	Weiss
Sawyer	Stark	Wheat
Saxton	Stokes	Whitten
Scheuer	Studds	Williams
Schneider	Sundquist	Wise
Schuette	Swift	Wolf
Schumer	Synar	Wolpe
Shays	Thomas (CA)	Wyden
Sikorski	Torres	Yates
Sisisky	Torricelli	

NOT VOTING—14

Bentley	de la Garza	Smith (IA)
Bryant	Florio	Smith (TX)
Chapman	McDermott	Wilson
Collins	Sabo	Wright
Courter	Savage	

□ 1409

Messrs. GOSS, KASTENMEIER, ROSE, HUCKABY, and DWYER of New Jersey changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. MARLENEE changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1410

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER:

Page 526, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 910. CONCERNING HONG KONG.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President should take such actions as may be necessary under the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit increased immigration from Hong Kong to the United States.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks the increase of the United States immigration quota for Hong Kong. When Li Peng and Deng Xiaoing turned tanks and guns against their own people, they did irreparable harm to Hong Kong. In 1997 Hong Kong will come under the control of the People's Republic of China.

Before Great Britain agreed to relinquish sovereignty, it got from Deng a litany of guarantees, Mr. Chairman: the guarantee that capitalist Hong Kong will be free to exist in Communist China; the guarantee that Hong Kong people would administer Hong Kong; that Hong Kong would retain a high degree of autonomy; and that Hong Kong's legislative and judicial branches would be independent of the National People's Congress.

In drafting Hong Kong's post-1997 constitution, Deng and his cronies

have one by one reneged on these guarantees.

As it stands now, that constitution will not allow full direct election of a chief executive until at least 1997 and then only if Beijing okays it. It provides that all Hong Kong laws can be vetoed by the People's Republic of China and does not retain any true human rights guarantees.

The Beijing massacre laid bare, if they had not been already, all of the guarantees given to Hong Kong. Confidence in Hong Kong is at an all-time low in the future. The stock market dropped down 25 percent in 1 day. Forty-five thousand people left in 1987 and more are expected to leave this year, Mr. Chairman. Sixty thousand was the estimate before Tiananmen Square and probably it is twice that number after.

A total of 3.4 million of Hong Kong's nationals were born in Hong Kong, Mr. Chairman, and yet they cannot go to Great Britain.

This is how the United States can help Hong Kong: We can insure that unless China lives up to its guarantees, the people of Hong Kong will have not only the right but the ability to leave. If Deng's brand of government continues, he will have had nothing more than an empty purse.

Hopefully, of course, Hong Kong, the people of Hong Kong will be able to stay. But if they must leave, the United States should welcome them.

Hong Kong is an economic miracle, Mr. Chairman. The per capita earning is 29 times greater than that of the People's Republic of China. The people of Hong Kong are people of talent, people of great entrepreneurial skill.

They understand as perhaps no others can on Earth the difference between totalitatianism and freedom. Many of them are, in fact, refugees from the People's Republic of China. They are, in sum, the very kind of people we need in the United States.

This amendment asks the President to do all in his power under the law to increase Hong Kong's immigration quota to the United States.

My legislation, H.R. 2657, would raise the quota from 5,000 to 50,000 per year.

Mr. Chairman, the students of Beijing did their best; the butchers of Beijing crushed their aspirations.

Insofar as we can, our country should work to insure that their brethren in Hong Kong have the right to live in freedom.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman is willing to withdraw his amendment, and therefore I will not have to press my point of order regarding the germaneness of this amendment, but I certainly understand the gentleman's concern and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration it is my intention that we will work with the gentleman's legislation in a prompt and expeditious manner, as well as other legislation in the immigration area relating to China as well as Hong Kong, in particular the legislation introduced by the gentlewoman from California which asks that we expand upon and improve the program that the President has announced for the People's Republic of China nationals who are here.

I would just caution all of us to recognize that in Hong Kong and in China itself and in Southeast Asia and in Latin America and in the Soviet Union there are literally millions of people around the world would like to live in the freedom that exists here in the United States. Balancing that desire against our ability to absorb refugees and immigrants is a difficult one. The committee is charged with that responsibility, the Committee on the Judiciary. Our Subcommittee on Immigration will do the very best we can by the gentleman's legislation. I think his raising the issue here today is an important part of the debate over the situation in China. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for it, and I hope that he will work with our subcommittee in resolving these issues.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in order to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify for the record that the earmark for child survival and health activities in H.R. 2655 establishes a floor on spending for these vital programs. It should also be clarified that funds for AIDS prevention and control may, and hopefully will, be used from sources of funding in the bill other than the earmarked funds for child survival and health.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. AID has authority to support all health activities over and above the amount earmarked in H.R. 2655 for such purposes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that clarification and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, if there are no other Members seeking recognition on my amendment, I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment based upon the assurances of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IX?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HERGER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERGER: Page 535, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 925. SUSPENSION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO INDIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Amnesty International has confirmed that in April 1989 a teenage Sikh girl was arrested by police in Laharka, held for three days, and repeatedly raped by a number of police officers.

(2) Such findings have been confirmed by the London Sunday Times and a local doctor, and were even acknowledged by the head of the Punjab Police.

(3) The Government of India has not taken any action against the officers suspected in this incident.

(4) Several Indian newspapers and magazines have reported on similar treatment of other women, including an incident in mid-April where an aged widow and her two daughters were beaten up and tortured by a police party headed by officers of the Beas police station in Butala Village.

(5) The Government of India has refused to allow Amnesty International to investigate such allegations.

(6) No other democratic nation refuses to allow Amnesty International access within its borders; even Nicaragua and Cuba have allowed Amnesty International to investigate human rights abuses.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress condemns the inaction by the Government of India relating to the incidents described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for development assistance which are allocated for India may be obligated or expended unless the President certifies to the Congress that—

(1) the individuals responsible for the incidents described in subsection (a) are identified, charged with the appropriate offenses, and imprisoned for their crimes;

(2) Amnesty International is allowed access to the Punjab to investigate the incidents described in subsection (a) and other charges of human rights abuses by the government; and

(3) the economic blockade of Nepal is lifted.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1420

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, there are 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say I believe this is the last amendment to this title. It would be our purpose to go to the next title, where I believe that all questions there have been resolved, and we could go to the next title that would be designated. We would then return, Mr. Chairman, to the reservation that we had with regard to section 707 of title VII. That would then move Members into the rest of the bill. I just wanted to remind my colleagues when the time expires.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Except for the unanimous-consent request on the title VII matter, unless the amendments are printed in the RECORD: Members would then have 5 minutes, and we would be out of general debate time, am I correct, in 17 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I do not want to use up all of the gentleman's time on his own amendment.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reclaim my time.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed level of United States economic assistance to India for fiscal year 1990 is $110.4 million. The amendment I am offering would reduce that amount by just $25 million, striking the developmental assistance portion of the proposed aid. But yet it would not make reductions in the $85 million worth of Public Law 480 food aid programs.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am offering this amendment is quite simple. India has a serious problem of officially tolerating human rights abuses against religious and ethnic minorities, and the Indian Government is presently doing nothing to correct this problem.

According to Amnesty International, thousands of Indian citizens from these minority groups, have been arrested and detained for up to 2 years without being charged with any criminal offense.

Furthermore, Amnesty International and the London Sunday Times allege female detainees have been raped by law enforcement personnel, with no action being taken against those who have committed these atrocities.

In one Indian province, according to Amnesty International, over a 16-year period, more than one women per week was raped in police custody.

Perhaps that is why India is the only democracy that has repeatedly refused to allow representatives of Amnesty International to investigate charges of human rights violations within their country.

In an era of high Federal deficits and restraints on Federal spending, I question whether sending an additional $25 million for development assistance to the Indian Government is an effective use of our tax dollars.

Moreover, the Indian Government has not shown itself to be a friend of the United States. For example, at the United Nations, India voted against the United States position 93 percent of the time in 1988, more so than either Cuba or the Soviet Union. At the United Nations, India refused to condemn the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, or the downing of Korean Air Lines flight 007, in which a Member of our own House of Representatives was killed.

Currently, India has an active nuclear weapons program, and is leasing a nuclear submarine from the Soviet Union. They have developed a missile capable of carrying nuclear warheads and have also provided financial assistance to the Communist government in Afghanistan.

India has been a bully to its neighbors as well—imposing a crippling economic blockade on Nepal—landing some 45,000 troops in Sri Lanka, and now refusing to remove them at the request of that nation's government.

Mr. Chairman, AID's 1990 congressional presentation notes that, and I quote "India's economy is thriving," and "India is on a new threshold of development" end quote. As the self-proclaimed world largest democracy, the Indian Government should be expected to eliminate the pattern of human rights abuses cited by Amnesty International in its August 1988 report. My amendment merely suggests that if it does not do so, the Indian Government should spend its own money, perhaps from the funds it now devotes to its nuclear weapons program, on the development projects under discussion today.

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

It is based on factual inaccuracies. If it were adopted, it would have a chilling effect on our relationship with the world's most populous democracy. In addition, if this amendment were adopted, it would entirely eliminate 100 percent of our development assistance program in a country in which one-third of all the poor people of the world actually reside.

It would eliminate $6 million for child survival activities. It would eliminate $1 million for a vaccination program. It would eliminate forestry programs. It would eliminate irrigation programs.

Now, what is the justification for taking $25 million away from development assistance, in a country which is the most populous democracy in the world, with over 250 million people living below the poverty level? We are told it is because, according to this amendment, some woman was raped in Punjab and not until the authorities identify, incarcerate and imprison those responsible, they do not get any development assistance. What about due process, What if they cannot prove a case against the people? This is virtually unheard of.

The amendment would make our whole development assistance program to India contingent on what happened in one incident in Punjab? There are human rights abuses in the Punjab, but I did not hear the author of the amendment say 90 to 95 percent of them are due to Sikh extremists murdering not only Hindus, but Sikhs, as well.

I would like to defend a country that identifies with the democratic values. I will be happy to yield when my time expires to the gentleman. The amendment says our development assistance to India should be eliminated if they cease to blockade. There is no blockade. There are border crossings still open with Nepal through which 90 percent of the commerce between India and Nepal passed prior to the dispute. There is no comprehensive total embargo or blockage which is imposed by India against Nepal. In the last few years, first the Reagan administration and then the Bush administration has brought about a quiet but significant improvement in our relations with India. If this amendment is adopted, it is a slap in the face against India and it will have a chilling impact on our relationship. The author of the amendment says that India votes against the United States 93 percent of the time at the United Nations, so, therefore, we should cut out the development assistance program.

□ 1430

Let me warn my friends on the other side of the aisle who might be inclined to support this amendment that if that is the basis on which to cut off development assistance to India, what about Pakistan, which gets six times as much aid as India but which votes against us at the United Nations 88 percent of the time? We are giving $600 million a year to Pakistan. They vote against us 88 percent of the time.

I do not hear any of my friends on the other side of the aisle saying that, therefore, we should cut out our aid to Pakistan, which is one of the largest recipients of aid from the United States. And I agree with them, that we should not cut aid to Pakistan. It is an important country. But so is India, the most populous democracy in the world and it is beginning to work with us in a number of areas. Finally, the amendment says that because they do not

permit Amnesty International into the Punjab, they should not get our development assistance. The fact of the matter is that they do permit representatives of Indian human rights organizations to go to the Punjab. They have been to the Punjab, and they have reported on the Punjab. In fact, in the last few months there has been a significant improvement. The Government of India has released political prisoners. It has acceded to a number of Sikh requests. It is moving in the right direction. If in spite of that this amendment is adopted, the chances are that it will bring the progress in the Punjab to an end.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the Members to vote against this strongly misguided amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, they are friends of the United States of America? They are our friends, right Mr. SOLARZ?

They are one of the few nations that did not condemn them, the shooting down of 007, the Korean airline on which one of our colleagues was killed. Friends of ours, Mr. SOLARZ?

They did not condemn the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. I think they were one of the two or three countries in the world that did not. Our friends, Mr. SOLARZ?

They vote with us 6.7 percent of the time at the United Nations. That means that 92.3 percent of the time they do not vote with us. They are good friends of ours, Mr. SOLARZ?

They took $10.4 million of our money, Mr. SOLARZ, and gave it to Daniel Ortega when he went to India, and they support that nation. They support the government in Kabul.

Friends of ours, Mr. SOLARZ? I do not know what you have been reading.

The fact of the matter is that there have been atrocities in the Punjab perpetrated on the people up there by the Indian Government. In addition to that, they are helping build Mig-29 fighter planes in India in conjunction with the Soviet Union. They are building tanks with the Soviet Union in India. They are in bed with the Soviet Union up here Mr. SOLARZ. So when you say they are good friends of the United States, I think we should take that with a grain of salt, maybe with a whole box full of salt.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say very quickly that women have been raped and mistreated in the Punjab. People have been tortured in the Punjab. Sikhs have been tortured by the police authorities, by the government authorities in India. So there is a reason for this amendment.

Let us read what this amendment says. It says that we are going to hold off that aid until the individuals responsible for these incidents are brought to justice. What is wrong with that?

It says we are going to hold off this aid until Amnesty International can go in and investigate these alleged atrocities and human rights violations. What is wrong with that?

And it says we will hold off until the economic blockade of Nepal is lifted. What is wrong with that?

I think this is a very well thought out amendment. I think it is a good amendment, one that we should all embrace and support. I think we should set the record straight, and I believe we have done a little bit of that just now. India is a very close friend of the Soviet Union, and they are friends of ours only when they need our money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Herger amendment. Having lived as a Peace Corps volunteer in Nepal for 2 years, I feel a special need to join in the voices who call for India to end the blockade of Nepal.

I was an agricultural extension agent and got a chance to travel throughout Nepal and India. The former is a tiny, landlocked nation. The latter a world power. While I was in India, visiting everywhere from Banares to Bombay, from Siliguiry to Srinagar, I grew to love and respect the language and culture that make India the vast and, to us sometimes, mysterious collection of people that it is.

In this case, though, there is no mystery. India is dead wrong. I ask that the government stop the blockade that is hurting their neighbor, Nepal, because I love and respect the Nepalese people and their culture, too.

There are few things I would claim to know better than others in this House. But when it comes to that part of the world, I must tell you I know perhaps as well as anyone here the hardship the Nepalese are experiencing because of this blockade.

Trucks carrying vital petroleum supplies are stopped at the border. The Nepalese are forced to use wood for basic fuel, and as a result their tropical rain forests are for the first time threatened. The people of Nepal exist at the mercy of the Indian Government. Schools are closed. Businesses are closed.

This is not only a regional issue. It is crucial to the rest of the world that India lift the blockade and resume the free flow of goods, to keep harmony in that part of the world and to show its good faith in dealing not only with Nepal, but with the United States as well.

The Treaty of Trade and Transit, which has expired after 29 years, was of mutual benefit to these countries.

I hope the roadways will be opened again soon.

Support the mission of Amnesty International, support the tropical rain forests, support the rights of the Nepalese to exist in harmony with a large, powerful neighbor—support the Herger amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. JACOBS). The Chair will announce that of the 8-hour agreement, 2 whole minutes remain.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS) rise?

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

There are enough real problems that have risen now and that have been addressed now in India to raise very real questions about their sincerity in solving their human rights problems. We know that a human rights situation does exist. If there is any way to get the attention of the Indian Government, I think that is the quickest and most effective way.

I am not comfortable voting against our friends from India and that government. They have made great strides in many directions, but they have refused to allow internationally recognized organizations in to investigate the serious allegations against them in the areas of their treatment of ethnic groups.

So I rise in support of the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] to bring the attention of the world to this serious question, and I hope that the Members of this body will rise in support of the amendment also.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 212, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—204

Andrews	Bartlett	Bliley
Applegate	Barton	Browder
Archer	Bateman	Brown (CO)
Armey	Bennett	Bunning
Baker	Bevill	Burton
Ballenger	Bilbray	Byron
Barnard	Bilirakis	Callahan

Campbell (CO)	Jacobs	Roukema
Chandler	James	Rowland (CT)
Clement	Johnson (SD)	Rowland (GA)
Coble	Jones (GA)	Russo
Coleman (MO)	Jontz	Sarpalius
Combest	Kasich	Saxton
Coughlin	Kolbe	Schaefer
Cox	Kyl	Schneider
Craig	Lagomarsino	Schroeder
Crane	Lancaster	Schuette
Dannemeyer	Laughlin	Schulze
Darden	Leath (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Davis	Lehman (CA)	Shaw
DeLay	Lewis (FL)	Shays
DeWine	Lightfoot	Shumway
Dickinson	Livingston	Shuster
Dornan (CA)	Lloyd	Sisisky
Dreier	Lukens, Donald	Skeen
Duncan	Machtley	Slaughter (VA)
Early	Madigan	Smith (MS)
Edwards (OK)	Marlenee	Smith (NE)
Emerson	Martin (IL)	Smith (TX)
English	Martin (NY)	Smith, Denny (OR)
Erdreich	McCandless	Smith, Robert (NH)
Fawell	McCollum	Smith, Robert (OR)
Fazio	McCrery	Snowe
Fields	McDade	Solomon
Flippo	McEwen	Spence
Ford (MI)	McGrath	Staggers
Gallegly	McMillan (NC)	Stallings
Gaydos	McNulty	Stangeland
Gekas	Miller (OH)	Stearns
Gillmor	Molinari	Stenholm
Gingrich	Mollohan	Stump
Goodling	Montgomery	Sundquist
Goss	Moorhead	Tallon
Gradison	Murphy	Tanner
Grandy	Myers	Tauke
Grant	Natcher	Tauzin
Hall (TX)	Neal (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Hammerschmidt	Nelson	Thomas (GA)
Hancock	Nielson	Thomas (WY)
Hansen	Oxley	Traficant
Harris	Packard	Traxler
Hastert	Parker	Upton
Hatcher	Parris	Valentine
Hayes (LA)	Pashayan	Vander Jagt
Hefley	Patterson	Vucanovich
Hefner	Paxon	Walker
Henry	Perkins	Walsh
Herger	Pickle	Watkins
Hiler	Price	Weber
Holloway	Pursell	Weldon
Hopkins	Ravenel	Whittaker
Houghton	Ray	Whitten
Hubbard	Rhodes	Williams
Huckaby	Ritter	Wolf
Hunter	Roberts	Wylie
Hutto	Robinson	Young (FL)
Hyde	Roe	
Inhofe	Rogers	
Ireland	Roth	

NOES—212

Ackerman	Clarke	Flake
Akaka	Clay	Foglietta
Alexander	Clinger	Ford (TN)
Anderson	Coleman (TX)	Frank
Annunzio	Conte	Frenzel
Anthony	Conyers	Frost
Aspin	Cooper	Gallo
Atkins	Costello	Gejdenson
AuCoin	Coyne	Gephardt
Bates	Crockett	Gibbons
Beilenson	de la Garza	Gilman
Bereuter	DeFazio	Glickman
Berman	Dellums	Gonzalez
Boehlert	Derrick	Gordon
Boggs	Dicks	Gray
Bonior	Dingell	Green
Borski	Dixon	Guarini
Bosco	Donnelly	Gunderson
Boucher	Dorgan (ND)	Hall (OH)
Boxer	Downey	Hamilton
Brennan	Durbin	Hayes (IL)
Brooks	Dwyer	Hertel
Broomfield	Dyson	Hoagland
Brown (CA)	Eckart	Hochbrueckner
Bruce	Edwards (CA)	Hoyer
Buechner	Engel	Hughes
Bustamante	Espy	Jenkins
Campbell (CA)	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Cardin	Fascell	Johnston
Carper	Feighan	Jones (NC)
Carr	Fish	Kanjorski
Kaptur	Moody	Sangmeister
Kastenmeier	Morella	Savage
Kennedy	Morrison (CT)	Sawyer
Kennelly	Morrison (WA)	Scheuer
Kildee	Mrazek	Schiff
Kleczka	Murtha	Schumer
Kolter	Nagle	Sharp
Kostmayer	Neal (MA)	Sikorski
LaFalce	Nowak	Skaggs
Lantos	Oakar	Skelton
Leach (IA)	Oberstar	Slattery
Lehman (FL)	Obey	Slaughter (NY)
Leland	Olin	Smith (FL)
Lent	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Levin (MI)	Owens (NY)	Smith (VT)
Levine (CA)	Owens (UT)	Solarz
Lewis (CA)	Pallone	Spratt
Lewis (GA)	Panetta	Stark
Lipinski	Payne (NJ)	Stokes
Long	Payne (VA)	Studds
Lowery (CA)	Pease	Swift
Lowey (NY)	Pelosi	Synar
Luken, Thomas	Penny	Torres
Manton	Petri	Torricelli
Markey	Pickett	Towns
Martinez	Porter	Udall
Matsui	Poshard	Unsoeld
Mavroules	Quillen	Vento
Mazzoli	Rahall	Visclosky
McCloskey	Rangel	Volkmer
McCurdy	Regula	Walgren
McHugh	Richardson	Waxman
McMillen (MD)	Ridge	Weiss
Meyers	Rinaldo	Wheat
Mfume	Rohrabacher	Wise
Michel	Rose	Wolpe
Miller (CA)	Rostenkowski	Wyden
Miller (WA)	Roybal	Yates
Mineta	Sabo	Yatron
Moakley	Saiki	

NOT VOTING—16

Bentley	Dymally	Smith (IA)
Bryant	Florio	Wilson
Chapman	Garcia	Wright
Collins	Hawkins	Young (AK)
Courter	Horton	
Douglas	McDermott	

□ 1458

Messrs. MFUME, JOHNSTON of Florida, DE LA GARZA, SMITH of Vermont, and SHARP changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. JONES of Georgia, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mrs. BYRON changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title IX?

If not, the Clerk will designate title X.

The text of title X is as follows:

TITLE X—AFRICA

CHAPTER 1—AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 1001. SHORT TITLE.

This chapter may be cited as the "Africa Famine Recovery and Development Act".

SEC. 1002. AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT.

Title VI of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended by titles VII and IX of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"CHAPTER 3—AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT

"SEC. 6301. LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

"(a) AUTHORITY TO FURNISH ASSISTANCE.—The President is authorized to furnish project and program assistance for long-term development in sub-Saharan Africa.

"(b) PURPOSE OF ASSISTANCE.—The purpose of assistance under this section shall be to help the poor majority of men and women in sub-Saharan Africa to participate in a process of long-term development through economic growth that is—

"(1) equitable, in that it enables the poor to increase their incomes and their access to productive resources and services so that they can satisfy their basic needs and lead lives of decency, dignity, and hope;

"(2) participatory, in that it enables the poor to contribute knowledge and other resources and to make and influence decisions that affect their lives;

"(3) environmentally sustainable, in that it maintains and restores the renewable natural resource base of the economy and wisely uses nonrenewable resources; and

"(4) self-reliant, in that it is based on indigenous institutions, private and public, local and national, that have the capacity (including the human resources and finances) to carry out development policies.

Assistance provided under this section should also, in a manner consistent with the preceding provisions of this subsection, encourage private sector development and promote individual initiatives and help to reduce the role of central governments in areas more appropriate for the private sector.

"(c) APPLICATION OF FOUR BASIC OBJECTIVES.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, assistance under this section shall be provided consistent with the policies expressed in section 1102.

"(d) PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS.—

"(1) CONSULTATION TO ENSURE LOCAL PERSPECTIVES.—The administering agency shall take into account the local-level perspectives of the rural and urban poor in sub-Saharan Africa, including women, during the planning process for project and program assistance under this section. In order to gain that perspective, the administering agency shall, through specific mechanisms in each country assisted, consult closely with African, United States, and other private voluntary organizations which have demonstrated effectiveness in or commitment to the promotion of local, grassroots activities on behalf of long-term development in sub-Saharan Africa as described in subsection (b).

"(2) FUNDING FOR STRENGTHENING OF DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS.—In carrying out this section, the administering agency shall make available funds for a significant (relative to fiscal year 1989) long-term expansion and strengthening of development efforts by African, United States, and other private voluntary organizations which have demonstrated effectiveness in or a commitment to the promotion of local grassroots activities on behalf of long-term development in sub-Saharan Africa as described in subsection (b).

"(3) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'private voluntary organization' includes (in addition to entities traditionally considered to be private voluntary organizations) cooperatives, credit unions, trade unions, women's groups, higher education institutions, nonprofit development research institutions, other intermediaries, and indigenous local organizations, which are private and nonprofit.

"(e) LOCAL INVOLVEMENT IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.—Local people, including women, shall be closely consulted and involved in all stages of the implementation of every

project under this section which has a local focus.

"(f) PARTICIPATION OF AFRICAN WOMEN.—The administering agency shall ensure that development activities assisted under this section incorporate a significant expansion of the participation (including decision-making) and integration of African women in each of the critical sectors described in subsection (h).

"(g) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—

"(1) PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS CRITICAL SECTORAL PRIORITIES.—Assistance under this section shall emphasize primarily projects and programs to address critical sectoral priorities for long-term development described in subsection (h).

"(2) REFORM OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICIES.—

"(A) USE OF PROGRAM ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under this section may also include program assistance to promote reform of national economic policies to support the critical sectoral priorities for long-term development described in subsection (h).

"(B) EXAMPLES OF NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY REFORMS WHICH CAN BE SUPPORTED.—Assistance may be provided under subparagraph (A) to support such national economic policy reforms as correction of overvalued exchange rates, reduction of government budget deficits, raising of real prices of food crops, reform or privatization of inefficient parastatal enterprises, improved public management, and other reforms suggested in the consultation process pursuant to subsection (d)(1) which reflect the local-level perspective of the rural and urban poor in sub-Saharan Africa.

"(C) PROTECTION OF VULNERABLE GROUPS.—Assisted policy reforms shall also include provisions to protect vulnerable groups (especially poor, isolated, and female farmers and the urban poor) and long-term environmental interests from possible negative consequences of the reforms.

"(3) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—Funds made available to carry out this section shall be used almost exclusively for assistance in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2). Limited amounts of assistance, however, may be furnished under this section to address other priorities for long-term development in sub-Saharan Africa as described in subsection (b) if, at least 15 days before funds are obligated for such assistance, the President notifies the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 4304.

"(h) CRITICAL SECTORAL PRIORITIES.—The critical sectoral priorities for long-term development as described in subsection (b) are the following:

"(1) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—

"(A) AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION.—Increasing agricultural production in ways which protect and restore the natural resource base, especially food production, through agricultural policy changes at the macroeconomic and sector levels, agricultural research (including participatory research directly involving small farmers) and extension, development and promotion of agriculture marketing activities, credit facilities, and appropriate production packages, and the construction and improvement of needed production-related infrastructure such as farm-to-market roads, small-scale irrigation, and rural electrification. Emphasis shall be given to promoting increased equity in rural income distribution, recognizing the role of small farmers (the majority of whom are women) and the farm family.

"(B) NATURAL RESOURCE BASE.—Maintaining and restoring the renewable natural resource base in ways which increase agricultural production, through the following:

"(i) Primary emphasis on small-scale, affordable, resource-conserving, low-risk local projects, using appropriate technologies (including traditional agricultural methods) suited to local environmental, resource, and climatic conditions, and featuring close consultation with and involvement of local people at all stages of project design and implementation. Emphasis shall be given to grants for African local government organizations, international or African nongovernmental organizations, and United States private voluntary organizations.

"(ii) Significant support for efforts at national and regional levels to provide technical and other support for projects of the kinds described in clause (i) and to strengthen the capacities of African countries to provide effective extension and other services in support of environmentally sustainable increases in food production.

"(iii) Significant support for special training and education efforts to improve the capacity of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to manage their own environments and natural resources.

"(2) HEALTH.—Improving health conditions, with special emphasis on meeting the health needs of mothers and children through the establishment of self-sustaining primary health care systems that give priority to preventive health.

"(3) VOLUNTARY POPULATION PLANNING.—Providing voluntary population planning, including increased access to voluntary family planning services, including encouragement of private, community, and local government initiatives.

"(4) EDUCATION.—Improving the relevance to production and the efficiency of education, with substantial attention given to improving basic literacy and numeracy, especially to those outside the formal educational system, and improving primary education.

"(5) INCOME-GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES.—Developing income-generating opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed in urban and rural areas. Off-farm employment opportunities in micro- and small-scale labor-intensive enterprises shall be emphasized.

"(i) MINIMUM LEVELS OF ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN CRITICAL SECTORS.—The following requirements apply with respect to fiscal years 1990, 1991, and 1992:

"(1) NATURAL RESOURCES.—The aggregate amount used for each 2 consecutive fiscal years for activities described in subsection (h)(1)(B), including identifiable components of agricultural production projects, shall not be less than 10 percent of the aggregate amount made available to carry out this section for those two fiscal years.

"(2) HEALTH.—The aggregate amount used for each 2 consecutive fiscal years for activities described in subsection (h)(2) shall not be less than 10 percent of the aggregate amount made available to carry out this section for those two fiscal years.

"(3) VOLUNTARY POPULATION PLANNING.—The aggregate amount used for each 2 consecutive fiscal years for activities described in subsection (h)(3) shall not be less than 10 percent of the aggregate amount made available to carry out this section for those two fiscal years.

"(j) IN-COUNTRY NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL TRAINING.—The Administrator shall use not less than the following amounts of the funds made available to carry out this section for in-country natural resources and environmental training in sub-Saharan Africa:

"(1) For fiscal year 1990, the amount used for such training for fiscal year 1989.

"(2) For fiscal year 1991 and each fiscal year thereafter, not less than 4 percent of the funds made available for that fiscal year pursuant to subsection (i)(1) to carry out subsection (h)(1)(B).

Local currencies accruing under this Act or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 may be used in carrying out this subsection in lieu of an equal amount of dollars.

"(k) EFFECTIVE USE OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance provided under this section shall be concentrated in countries which will make the most effective use of such assistance in order to fulfill the purpose specified in subsection (b), especially those countries (including those of the Sahel region) having the greatest need for outside assistance. Assistance shall not be allocated for a project or program in a country where the relevant sector or national economic policies are clearly unfavorable to the sustainability or broadened impact of the assisted activity.

"(l) LOCAL CURRENCIES GENERATED UNDER OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Local currencies generated in sub-Saharan Africa under the economic support assistance program under title I of this Act or under section 106(b)(2), section 206, or title III of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 that are to be used for development activities shall be used only for activities which would be eligible for assistance under this section.

"(m) DONOR COORDINATION MECHANISM.—Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to assist the governments of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to increase their capacity to participate effectively in donor coordination mechanisms at the country, regional, and sector levels.

"(n) POLICY ON USE OF FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF OFFICIAL DEBT.—It shall be the policy of the United States that funds made available to carry out this section not be used to make payments with respect to any official debt owed to the United States Government, any foreign government, or any multilateral lending institution. Exceptions to this policy may be made—

"(1) only in certain instances where the recipient country's debt service is a significant barrier to development and where such payments would have a significant effect in leveraging additional flows of development finance; and

"(2) only after consultation with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

"(o) RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORITIES.—The authority granted by this section to provide assistance for long-term development in sub-Saharan Africa is not intended to preclude the use of other authorities for that purpose. Centrally-funded programs which benefit sub-Saharan Africa shall continue to be funded under the development assistance program under title I.

"SEC. 6302. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

"(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to

carry out section 6301 $580,000,000 for fiscal year 1990, $610,000,000 for fiscal year 1991, $640,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, $670,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, and $700,000,000 for fiscal year 1994.

"(b) EXTENDED AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the authority of section 5302 should be used to extend the period of availability of the funds made available under this section whenever appropriate to improve the quality of assistance provided under section 6301.

"SEC. 6303. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES.

"(a) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT FOR PREPARATION OF PLAN.—The Administrator shall develop, in a timely manner, a plan for organizational changes within the administering agency in order to carry out section 6301 with maximum effectiveness.

"(2) SUBMISSION OF PLAN TO CONGRESS.—Before implementing that plan, the Administrator shall submit a copy of the plan to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

"(b) FUNDING FOR INCREASED AID ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.—The Administrator may transfer up to 5 percent of the funds made available each fiscal year under section 6302 to the appropriations account for the operating expenses of the administering agency for use in increasing (above the level of resources available for fiscal year 1989) the organizational resources which the administering agency has available for development assistance activities for sub-Saharan Africa. These funds shall be in addition to amounts otherwise allocated to the administering agency's Bureau for Africa.".

SEC. 1003. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION DOCUMENTS.—Section 4301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as enacted by title IV of this Act, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting the following new subsection (d) after subsection (c):

"(d) AFRICA FAMINE RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT.—The documents submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include a description of the progress made during the previous fiscal year in carrying out chapter 3 of title VI, including, for each country and for sub-Saharan Africa as a whole, a brief description of—

"(1) the activities undertaken and the modes of assistance employed, including—

"(A) the amounts of funds obligated, and

"(B) the amounts of generated local currencies used by host governments for development activities in accordance with sections 5321 and 6301(l);

"(2) consultation to ensure local perspectives as described in section 6301(d)(1);

"(3) the assistance provided to private voluntary organizations pursuant to section 6301(d)(2), specifying the amounts obligated for such assistance and comparing these amounts with those provided for the previous fiscal year;

"(4) the consultation with and involvement of local people in the implementation of projects having a local focus;

"(5) the extent to which there has been a significant expansion of the participation and integration of African women in each of the critical sectors specified in section 6301(h);

"(6) program assistance provided to promote national economic policy reforms, including the amounts obligated and the specific criteria used for assistance for national economic policy reforms;

"(7) assistance for the critical sectoral priorities specified in section 6301(h), by sector, including the amounts obligated;

"(8) the concentration of assistance by country, and any decision not to allocate assistance because of unfavorable sector or national economic policies;

"(9) organizational changes undertaken pursuant to section 6303, and amounts obligated for these changes; and

"(10) assistance provided to the governments of countries in sub-Saharan Africa for donor coordination efforts, including the amounts obligated.".

(b) REPROGRAMMING NOTIFICATIONS.—Section 4304(d) of that Act, as enacted by title IV of this Act, is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(6) sections 6301 (relating to assistance for famine recovery and development in Africa).".

SEC. 1004. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 480.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) in section 106(b)(2), by inserting "or, in the case of sub-Saharan Africa, the objectives of paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 6301(h) of that Act," after "Foreign Assistance Act of 1961";

(2) in clause (A) of section 206(a)(3), by inserting "(or in the case of sub-Saharan Africa, paragraph (1) of section 6301(h) of that Act)" after "Foreign Assistance Act of 1961"; and

(3) in section 301(b), by inserting "or, in the case of sub-Saharan Africa, the objectives of paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 6301(h) of that Act," after "Foreign Assistance Act of 1961".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) take effect on the date specified in section 601.

SEC. 1005. AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the purposes of the African Development Foundation, as set forth in the African Development Foundation Act, which include supporting self-help activities at the local level, fostering effective participation, and encouraging the establishment and growth of indigenous development institutions which can respond to the requirements of the poor, are consistent with the purpose specified in section 6302(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (as enacted by section 1002 of this title).

(b) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 510 of the African Development Foundation Act is amended by striking out all of the first sentence that follows "purpose," and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and $10,500,000 for fiscal year 1991.".

(c) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—

(1) REQUIREMENT THAT THE BOARD BE BIPARTISAN.—Section 507(a) of the African Development Foundation Act is amended by adding at the end the following: "Members of the Board shall be appointed so that no more than 4 members of the Board are members of any one political party.".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) does not affect an appointment made to the Board of the African Development Foundation before the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITIES.—Section 511 of the African Development Foundation Act is repealed.

SEC. 1006. UNITED STATES TRADE RESTRICTIONS ON PRODUCTS FROM SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

It is the sense of the Congress that special efforts should be undertaken to reduce trade barriers and promote economic interchange between the United States and developing countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

CHAPTER 2—OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

SEC. 1021. ECONOMIC SUPPORT ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Of the amounts made available for economic support assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $53,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 shall be available only for sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 1022. SUPPORT FOR THE SOUTHERN AFRICA DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION CONFERENCE.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR SADCC PROJECTS.—

(1) EARMARKING OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts made available for development assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not less than $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1990 and not less than $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 shall be available only to assist sector projects supported by the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) to enhance the economic development of the 9 member states forming that regional institution.

(2) USES OF FUNDS.—The amounts made available pursuant to this subsection each fiscal year shall be available for the following sectors: transportation; manpower development; agriculture and natural resources; energy (including the improved utilization of electrical power sources which already exist in the member states and offer the potential to swiftly reduce the dependence of those states on South Africa for electricity); and industrial development and trade (including private sector initiatives).

(3) WAIVER OF RESTRICTIONS.—Funds made available pursuant to this subsection may be used without regard to section 4209 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any similar provision.

(b) SECURITY OF SADCC PROJECTS.—The Congress urges the President to use diplomatic means, including multilateral negotiations and cooperation with international organizations, to protect the security of projects supported by the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference from external attack, and urges the Government of South Africa to respect the territorial integrity of these states and to refrain from direct or indirect military aggression across its borders.

SEC. 1023. ASSISTANCE FOR BURUNDI.

(a) CONSIDERATIONS IN FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—For fiscal years 1990 and 1991, in determining whether to furnish assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Burundi, the President shall take into account whether the Government of Burundi—

(1) is making substantial progress in advancing the internal reform of its military and civil administration and ensuring discipline and control in military and administrative interactions with people of Hutu ethnicity; and

(2) is making substantial progress in further reversing patterns of ethnic discrimination against the majority Hutu, through equality of access to economic opportunities and public services and through increased respect for internationally recognized human rights.

(b) NOTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.—At least 15 days before each obligation of funds for assistance for Burundi for fiscal year 1990 or 1991 under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 4304 of that Act.

SEC. 1024. ASSISTANCE FOR KENYA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The provision to Kenya of economic support assistance and foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 shall bear a relation to significant steps by the Government of Kenya to increase respect for internationally recognized human rights in Kenya. Such steps should include—

(1) an end to intimidation and harassment of elements of Kenyan society that are critical of the Government's policies, especially the church, the press, and the legal community; and

(2) effective safeguards to ensure the independence of the judiciary and to guarantee due process and other rights for individuals imprisoned or otherwise detained by the Government.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of State shall, not later than February 1, 1990, and not later than February 1, 1991, report to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the actions the United States Government has taken to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 1025. ASSISTANCE FOR LIBERIA.

(a) CONSIDERATIONS IN FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal years 1990 and 1991, in determining whether to furnish economic support assistance and foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Liberia, the President shall take into account whether the Government of Liberia—

(1) has demonstrated its commitment to economic reform, including taking steps to fundamentally change the current financial practice of making extra-budgetary expenditures, including steps to channel the revenues from such major sources as the Liberia Petroleum Refinery Corporation and the Forestry Development Authority through the normal budgetary process; and

(2) has taken significant steps to increase respect for internationally recognized human rights including—

(A) the removal of all restrictions on the right of political parties to operate freely;

(B) the lifting of restrictions on freedom of the press; and

(C) the restoration of an independent judiciary.

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—At least 15 days before each obligation of funds described in subsection (c), the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 4304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) ASSISTANCE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (b) applies with respect to any obligation of funds for Liberia—

(1) for fiscal year 1990 or 1991 for economic support assistance or foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; or

(2) for any fiscal year before fiscal year 1990 for assistance under the authority of chapter 2 of part II of that Act (relating to grant military assistance) or chapter 4 of part II of that Act (relating to the economic support fund), as in effect before the effective date specified in section 601 of this Act.

SEC. 1026. ASSISTANCE FOR MOZAMBIQUE.

(a) STATEMENTS OF POLICY.—

(1) BILATERAL ACTIONS.—It shall be the policy of the United States—

(A) to continue and to expand its bilateral development assistance to Mozambique through appropriate private and public channels;

(B) to strengthen Mozambique's transport sector through United States assistance to the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference;

(C) to identify additional opportunities in the health and other sectors in Mozambique for United States support of Mozambique's reconstruction; and

(D) to contribute to Mozambique's national reconciliation in ways which do not legitimate the heinous behavior of the Mozambique National Resistance (RENAMO) or subordinate Mozambique's sovereign interests to RENAMO's principal patron, South Africa.

(2) MULTILATERAL ACTIONS.—It shall be the policy of the United States to encourage international support for generous levels of emergency humanitarian aid (including food, medical care, shelter, and agricultural assistance) for the one third of Mozambique's population that is displaced or otherwise at-risk in that country, as well as the approximately 1,000,000 Mozambique refugees now located in neighboring countries.

(b) ACTIONS TO TERMINATE EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE TO RENAMO.—The United States shall use diplomatic and other means to condemn and achieve the immediate termination of South African and other external assistance to RENAMO, whose deplorable actions include the systematic murder of 100,000 or more civilians and noncombatants (including children), the systematic rape of civilian women, the abduction of thousands of civilians and the imposition of forced labor, the systematic torture of civilians (including physical mutilation), and the destruction of villages.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) RELATION TO HUMAN RIGHTS.—The provision to Mozambique of economic support assistance and foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 shall bear a relation to significant steps by the Government of Mozambique to increase respect for internationally recognized human rights in Mozambique, and thereby raise hope for a political settlement to the conflict in that country. Such steps should include—

(A) limiting the detention powers of the state security forces (SNASP),

(B) ending extralegal floggings,

(C) ending the practice of holding detainees incommunicado or for prolonged periods without trial, and

(D) permitting peaceful opposition to Government policies.

(2) SADCC PROJECTS.—This subsection does not apply with respect to assistance made available pursuant to section 1022.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of State shall, not later than February 1, 1990, and not later than February 1, 1991, report to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the actions the United States Government has taken to carry out this section.

SEC. 1027. ASSISTANCE FOR SOMALIA.

(a) CONSIDERATIONS IN FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal years 1990 and 1991, in determining whether to furnish economic support assistance and foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Somalia, the President shall take into account whether the Government of Somalia has taken steps to increase respect for internationally recognized human rights that provide significant hope for political reconciliation and a political solution to the current conflict, including—

(1) the release of all political prisoners;

(2) effective restrictions on indiscriminate use of military force against civilians;

(3) meaningful dialogue with the opposition; and

(4) provision for the delivery of assistance under neutral international auspices to civilians affected by the conflict, regardless of their location or political affiliation.

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—At least 15 days before each obligation of funds described in subsection (c), the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 4304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) ASSISTANCE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (b) applies with respect to any obligation of funds for Somalia—

(1) for fiscal year 1990 or 1991 for economic support assistance or foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; or

(2) for any fiscal year before fiscal year 1990 for assistance under the authority of chapter 2 of part II of that Act (relating to grant military assistance) or chapter 4 of part II of that Act (relating to the economic support fund), as in effect before the effective date specified in section 601 of this Act.

(d) FOOD ASSISTANCE.—Assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 may be provided for refugees in Somalia only if—

(1) an impartial counting of eligible beneficiaries of food assistance by the United States and other donors has been completed;

(2) all beneficiaries of such food assistance are disarmed; and

(3) the amount of such food assistance does not significantly exceed the number of beneficiaries of the assistance.

(e) INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—International disaster assistance provided by the United States for northern Somalia on account of the violence in 1988 shall directly benefit the victims of the violence,

with primary emphasis on the original inhabitants of the regions affected.

SEC. 1028. ASSISTANCE FOR SUDAN.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The United States deplores the devastating, man-made famine in Sudan, which killed an estimated 250,000 people in 1988. This famine is primarily caused by the civil war between the Government of Sudan and the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA), in which both parties have used food as a weapon of war and have obstructed relief deliveries. In addition to massive death and suffering, starvation and warfare have also displaced between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 southern Sudanese.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS IN FURNISHING ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal years 1990 and 1991, in determining whether to furnish economic support assistance and foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to Sudan, the President shall take into account whether the Government of Sudan—

(1) has made substantial, demonstrable progress in the effective delivery of increased relief to displaced populations in areas which the Sudan Government controls; and

(2) has made good faith efforts to achieve significant progress in negotiations with the Sudan People's Liberation Army for a national peace accord which includes such steps as a cease-fire, a freeze on the implementation of Sharia law, and a constitutional convention.

(c) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—At least 15 days before each obligation of funds described in subsection (d), the President shall notify the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 4304 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(d) ASSISTANCE SUBJECT TO NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (c) applies with respect to any obligation of funds for Sudan—

(1) for fiscal year 1990 or 1991 for economic support assistance or foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; or

(2) for any fiscal year before fiscal year 1990 for assistance under the authority of chapter 2 of part II of that Act (relating to grant military assistance) or chapter 4 of part II of that Act (relating to the economic support fund), as in effect before the effective date specified in section 601 of this Act.

SEC. 1029. ASSISTANCE FOR ZAIRE.

(a) LIMITATION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE.—Of the amounts made available for foreign military financing under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not more than $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 may be made available for Zaire.

(b) ECONOMIC SUPPORT ASSISTANCE.—Economic support assistance may not be provided for Zaire for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE.—Any assistance for famine recovery and development in Africa, and any development assistance, that is furnished for Zaire for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be provided through private voluntary organizations to the maximum extent practicable.

SEC. 1030. AIDS IN AFRICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the United States recognizes that the acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) is a serious problem in parts of Africa; and

(2) the humanitarian, social, political, and strategic implications of this crisis are potentially severe ones.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR RESEARCH AND TREATMENT OF AIDS.—The President is encouraged to use funds available for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 to provide funding at levels greater than those for previous fiscal years for the treatment of and research on AIDS in Africa.

CHAPTER 3—OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING TO AFRICA

SEC. 1041. FACTORS CONSIDERED IN FURNISHING ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is in the interest of the United States to encourage the promotion of human rights and political and economic freedom in all African countries. In furnishing United States assistance for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 to any country in Africa, the President should consider the country's record in human rights and in economic reform, and its friendship to the United States.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "United States assistance" means—

(1) assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, other than emergency humanitarian assistance under either such Act; and

(2) sales under the Defense Trade and Export Control Act.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the unanimous consent request of yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and I offer en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

En bloc amendments offered by Mr. FASCELL:

Page 454, strike out lines 9 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) PROHIBITION.—The United States shall not provide any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or make any sale under the Defense Trade and Export Control Act to any country pursuant to an agreement or other arrangement, either formal or informal, under which that country provides funds, material, or military training for any military or paramilitary operations of persons or groups engaged in an insurgency against the Government of Nicaragua. This subsection does not apply with respect to assistance provided by that country for the voluntary reintegration or relocation of members of the Nicaraguan Resistance consistent with the Bipartisan Accord on Central America of March 24, 1989, or pursuant to a regional peace agreement. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed of information available to the executive branch regarding assistance described in the first sentence of this subsection that is provided by other countries to the Nicaraguan Resistance.

□ 1500

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, when we conclude on this amendment, we will then be back at title X. As far as I know, we have no amendments on title X except an en bloc amendment, one discussion that I know of. We will then be able to proceed through the other titles with no amendments until title XIV, and I want to remind my colleagues that all time for debate under the rule has expired. Therefore, those amendments in title XIV that were printed in the RECORD, if they are called up, would have 5 minutes per side. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the gentleman is correct, 5 minutes each side.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation now to those who have worked so diligently yesterday, last night and today to resolve this matter with regard to section 7.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East and second in command.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, first, I should express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and the ranking Republican member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for their cooperation in bringing this compromise amendment forward. There are others, too, who deserve high praise for working out this genuine compromise. Those include the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT], who is the chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, and his ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], chairman of the Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, and it certainly includes members of the administration which were led by the Deputy Secretary of State, Larry Eagleburger.

The amendment that we present as a compromise provides that the United States shall not provide any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act or under the Defense Trade and Export Control Act pursuant to any agreement or other arrangement, either formal or informal, and I am describing the amendment which is a substitute for the language in section 707 of the committee bill; the compromise provides that the United States shall not provide any assistance under the foreign aid bill or under the Arms Export Control Act to any country pursuant to an agreement or pursuant to an arrangement, formal or informal, under which that country would agree to provide funds or material or trading for military or paramilitary operations to the Contras in Nicara-

gua. It also has in it a provision which requires the President to keep the Congress currently and fully informed of any information the executive branch has pertaining to the transfer of this assistance.

I think the amendment strengthens current law. It provides a workable compromise which meets the legitimate concerns of the Congress about assistance that might be provided to the Contras through third countries, and it does provide a mechanism through the reporting requirements that will enable more effective oversight of any funds, material, or military training provided to the Contras in Nicaragua.

This amendment expands the current law to include all formal and informal arrangements or agreements.

As far as I am aware, this agreement has the support of all parties who have been involved. It has the support of leaders on both sides of the aisle, and it has the support of the Deputy Secretary of State, Lawrence Eagleburger, speaking on behalf of the administration.

I might say to Members that the agreement was worked out with considerable effort this morning.

Finally, let me just say that the effectiveness of this provision depends on cooperation between the executive branch and the Congress, and that certainly depends upon very thorough and careful oversight by the Congress.

I know that the chairman of the committee joins me in expressing our determination on our part to make this provision work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank the gentleman from Indiana for working out this compromise, not only with the leaders of the Congress here in the House, but also the Deputy Secretary of State, and I think everybody is in agreement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], one of the principal people on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, for those who believe that the bipartisan accord on Central America represented a new approach where the United States would speak with one voice on our foreign policy in Central America, it is vital that this compromise language be approved and that the spirit of the bipartisan accord be retained.

To try to prevent the U.S. Government from discussing U.S. policy with other governments is clearly unconstitutional, and if the language passed by the committee had remained in the bill, the President likely would have had no choice but to veto this foreign-aid authorization bill, and for those who are anxious to achieve a foreign aid bill in this Congress, it is imperative that this compromise language be adopted.

The purpose of the language placed in current law was to prohibit the United States from conditioning its aid to a recipient country on the basis of that country giving aid to the Contras. To take that one step further, and legislate that the executive cannot engage in so much as a discussion with an AID recipient about U.S. policy toward the Contras is clearly unconstitutional. It would also be in direct contradiction of the agreement worked out under the bipartisan accord on Central America.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan compromise, and I join in commending the leaders of the Congress and the administration for achieving this settlement.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose handcuffing the President from discussing the current situation in Nicaragua with other countries. Limiting the President's power goes against all of our principles as a free and democratic country. We must continue to tell the world about the economic and political destruction of the Communist regime in Nicaragua.

The history of the Sandinistas is one of fear and repression, they are truly an enemy of the people. Again and again the violent Marxist regime of Nicaragua has broken their promises to their people and to the world. Only 8 days after they signed the Guatemala peace agreement, the Sandinistas broke up two peaceful demonstrations using dogs, sticks, and electric cattle prods and arrested the leaders.

In another instance, the Sandinistas allowed Radio Catolica, the Catholic radio station, to reopen after years of government imposed silence. The Communists promptly told the church it would only be allowed to play music—not report the news. The Sandinistas allow change but not real change.

Nicaragua is a perfect example of the failure of communism with its stagnant economy, human rights abuses and fleeing refugees. Nicaragua's inflation rate has exceeded 1,000 percent. The Soviet newspaper Isvestia recently admitted that "the majority of the stalls at the large central market in Managua are empty. There is no rice, meat, poultry or eggs."

The Sandinistas claim they will reform. But why would they embrace democratic reforms which could ultimately bring them down? They will not. They will make promises but they will not keep them.

For this reason, I urge my colleagues not to limit the President's ability to discuss the problems in Central America with other countries. If the United States appear to lose the resolve to protect democracy then there is no hope for the Nicaraguan people.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question, and I do not know whether it should be directed to the manager of the bill or to someone on the minority side. Let me propound it and see if anybody would like to try to answer it.

I do not know if Members are aware of what is happening here. The language in the bill with respect to Nicaragua is being replaced by the amendment which is being offered by the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, and by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Let me read, if I may, to Members the language which is stricken by this gentleman, and my question will be to whomever would like to answer. I understand that the language I am about to read which is stricken by this amendment is unacceptable to the administration. Not only that, I am given to understand that it is so unacceptable to the administration that were it to remain in the bill, it would in and of itself justify a veto, and I understand that that has been conveyed to this committee at a very high level from the administration.

With that in mind, I would ask Members to listen to the language which is so unacceptable to the administration and which is stricken by this amendment, and I quote:

The United States shall make no agreement and shall enter into no understanding, either formal or informal, under which a recipient of United States economic or military assistance or a purchaser of United States military equipment shall provide assistance of any kind to persons or groups engaging in an insurgency or other act of rebellion against the Government of Nicaragua.

□ 1510

One might say this is nitpicking in a sense, that the language is not very much different from the language in the amendment which replaces it.

My question is, particularly given that, what is it in this language struck by the amendment which is so offensive to the administration that it would in and of itself bring down a veto upon the bill? Is there any Member who can answer that question?

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

Mr. STUDDS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I think the problem with the language was that it was so broad and so all-encom-

passing that there was reasonable fear that if Honduras, and I am hypothesizing, were to provide transportation for Contras who wished to reintegrate themselves into Nicaragua, that might well be a violation of this law, it was so broadly drawn.

The purposes that were really intended, it seems to me, are satisfied by the compromise language worked out between both sides and the administration.

Mr. STUDDS. I thank the gentleman. Let me say to him I completely agree with him, the language does need one correction, and that is precisely to allow for the possibility of Honduras or some other nation engaging in relocation or resettlement pursuant to a peace accord. I have no problem with that part of the additional amendment whatsoever, and I think it is sound. However, that is not what was unacceptable to the administration, and it is precisely the language which is here that is rewritten by the first section of the amendment. I would have no question whatsoever if you simply sought to add that exception here, but what is it in the language which I cited for the need for that correction, which I grant to the gentleman, which is so inherently objectionable to the administration?

Mr. HYDE. If the gentleman will yield, I believe, and I am certainly not speaking for the administration, my understanding is, and from reading the language, that the administration would be very leery of negotiating with, talking about, reaching agreement with a country that on its own felt it incumbent to assist the democratic resistance in Nicaragua, and the mere fact of some colloquy between our country and their country might well impinge on the parameters of the language that was stricken. So it is ambiguous, it is vague. I just think they did not want to get into any marginal situations on the language which was ambiguous in that regard, and I think that presented to them a serious constitutional problem.

Mr. STUDDS. I appreciate the gentleman's response. Let me just finally observe that the language which is acceptable to the administration does indeed prohibit U.S. assistance to any country pursuant to an agreement or other arrangement, either formal or informal. That language is in the new amendment. The language which it replaces refers to no agreement and no understanding either formal or informal. I frankly do not see the difference, and I wonder if the gentleman can tell us wherein lies the difference, subtle though it is?

What worries me, frankly, and I guess this is obvious, is that if you and I, if you will accept for argument purposes, relatively rational and intelligent beings, find it difficult to differentiate between the language in the two versions, but somewhere someone in the administration feels as strongly as they do about it, then I wonder what we are missing.

Mr. HYDE. I understand the gentleman's concern and apprehension, and I will stipulate that we are both rational people beyond the purposes of our argument.

They just got the impression, and I felt the same way, that the language was so broad that it might have a chilling effect on talking to, or with the word understanding it is so broad that they prefer this language, and frankly, if you and I agree that it really accomplishes virtually the same thing that was intended by the sponsors, why who are we to argue?

Mr. STUDDS. I say to my good friend that I remain concerned, not the least for the reason the gentleman has been compelled both to stipulate and to hypothesize in response to my questions.

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

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I think the key difference is that the provision in the bill, that is the committee bill, does not make clear that what we are talking about is about what is being forbidden is making U.S. assistance a quid pro quo for aid to the Contras.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join Chairman FASCELL in expressing my strong support for the compromise language reached on Nicaragua. In particular, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO should be commended for their work in brokering this agreement.

The Pell language, which I might add is existing law, is preferable to this compromise agreement. However, this language is acceptable to the administration and indeed, essentially embodies the provisions of existing law. More importantly, enactment of this amendment removes a major impediment to administration support of this bill.

I would also like to say that I hope that the adoption of this amendment, along with the bipartisan accord enacted in March, signifies a new and lasting trust on Central America between the Congress and the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment offered by Chairman FASCELL and myself.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc amendments.

I rise in strong support of the en bloc amendment on Africa. It's a well-crafted compromise that enjoys strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, a new wind seems to be blowing in Africa. Last week, for the first time, the Angolan Government and the UNITA rebels agreed to a cease-fire to end their bloody civil war. I hope that neighboring countries, like Sudan, Ethiopia and others with similar debilitating wars, will follow this historic example and negotiate for peace. I think this legislation furthers the prospects of peace in Africa.

A country that desperately needs such an agreement is Ethiopia. I share the concerns expressed in the amendment about human rights in Ethiopia but I want to point out that the Ethiopian Government recently made an unprecedented offer to negotiate with its rebels in the north. One of the two major groups, the Tigrayan People's Liberation Front, accepted the offer. This is a real breakthrough in the 20-year civil war. I hope these talks will start soon and will be as successful as those in Angola.

Mr. Chairman, I recently returned from East Africa and saw for myself the poverty and deprivation there—these countries need all the help we can give them. I strongly support the bill's long-term development assistance to sub-Saharan Africa and urge my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment on Africa.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

EN BLOC AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the en bloc amendments.

The text of the en bloc amendments is as follows:

En bloc amendments offered by Mr. FASCELL: Page 567, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1042. POLICY TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA.

It is the sense of the Congress that the United States should work toward the elimination of apartheid through a comprehensive policy to bring about a nonracial democracy in South Africa. This policy should include, among other measures, assistance to disadvantaged South Africans that does not support organizations or groups controlled and financed by the Government of South Africa. Such assistance may include the encouragement of private investment in firms owned by disadvantaged South Africans consistent with the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, scholarships, assistance to promote the participation of disadvantaged South Africans in trade unions and priate enterprise, and alternative education and community development programs. It is also the sense of the Congress that United States firms in South Africa should provide similar assistance. In addition, the President should seek the cooperation of United States allies in Western Europe and Japan to join in similar multilateral initiatives to aid disadvantaged South Africans.

Page 567, after line 19, insert the following:

SEC. 1042. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ANGOLA.

(a) UNITED STATES POLICY.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should continue to vigorously promote direct talks between the leaders of the Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) and the Movement for the Popular Liberation of Angola (MPLA) Government to achieve an agreement for a process of national reconciliation among Angolans;

(2) the United States should continue its policy of refusing to recognize a government in Angola and opposing credits to Angola by the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development until—

(A) there is an agreement on national reconciliation acceptable to both sides, or

(B) the President determines that there has been significant progress toward such an agreement and that modification of such policy would be in the best interests of the United States.

(b) COMMENDING PRESIDENT MOBUTU SESE SEKO OF ZAIRE.—

(1) The Congress makes the following findings:

(A) President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire organized and hosted a gathering of 18 African heads of state in Gbadolite, Zaire (the Gbadolite Summit) on June 22, 1989.

(B) Such gathering brought together President Jose Edouardo Dos Santos and Dr. Jonas Savimbi, leaders of two parties that have been in conflict in Angola for many years, and resulted in an agreement to a ceasefire and the launching of negotiations leading to national reconciliation in Angola.

(C) The Gbadolite Summit followed the Angola-Namibia Accords, signed in New York on December 22, 1988, which called for total Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola, withdrawal of South African forces from the region, and the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 435 for the independence of Namibia.

(D) Following the signature of such Accords, many African leaders supported active diplomatic efforts to assure that the next step in the search for peace in southwestern Africa, national reconciliation in Angola, would move forward.

(E) The Gbadolite summit was the culmination of these intra-African negotiations in which President Mobutu played a key role.

(F) An African solution for an African problem is now well under way to fruition.

(G) President Mobutu will be in Washington for an official visit to the United States from June 28 through 30, 1989.

(H) President Mobutu, who for over a quarter century has been an effective partner with the United States in Africa, deserves the congratulations and support of the Government and people of the United States for his efforts.

(2) It is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire deserves the heartfelt congratulations and the gratitude of the United States and the American people for arranging the Gbadolite summit to further the process leading to peace and stability in southwestern Africa;

(B) the efforts of President Jose Edouardo Dos Santos of Angola to forge a compromise with Dr. Savimbi have created a basis for peace and national reconciliation in Angola;

(C) Dr. Jonas Savimbi's efforts to bring national reconciliation to his nation of Angola have been rewarded with an opportunity for peace and the accomplishment of his long-sought objective, peace in the region; and

(D) the full implementation of the process agreed to at Gbadolite will lead to a peaceful, secure, and stable southern African region.

Page 561, after line 5, insert the following new paragraph:

(2) RELATION TO RECONCILIATION.—The provision to Mozambique of assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 shall bear a relation to a continuing commitment by the Government of Mozambique to talks, direct or indirect, with RENAMO aimed at a political solution to Mozambique's internal war that respects internationally-recognized human rights and promotes pluralism.

Page 561, line 6, strike "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 556, after line 4, insert the following new section (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 1024. ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST ETHIOPIA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The Congress—

(1) condemns the pervasive, systematic abuse of human rights by the Government of Ethiopia, including the continued imprisonment of thousands of political prisoners and detainees and the numerous summary executions carried out in reprisal for the attempted coup of May, 1989;

(2) deplores the Government of Ethiopia's continued lack of demonstrated progress in negotiating a peaceful settlement to internal conflicts in the north and in effecting macroeconomic reforms;

(3) finds that without fundamental reform of the Ethiopian state or peaceful resolution of Ethiopia's internal wars, there will be no end to Ethiopia's deep social crisis, no prospects of a transition to stability, growth and liberty in Ethiopia, and minimal hope that the Horn of Africa will reverse the spread of devastating internal wars that have created massive human dislocations across the region;

(4) favors the resumption of United States assistance to Ethiopia for development and reconstruction, in the event there is clear progress in resolving Ethiopia's internal wars, improving human rights including the rights of all people to emigrate, travel, and observe religious holidays, and implementing economic reforms;

(5) urges the President and the Secretary of State to focus world pressure and opinion—

(A) upon the Government of Ethiopia to foreswear summary executions, release political prisoners, and reform Ethiopia's macroeconomic policies and facilitate family reunification and

(B) upon the Government of Ethiopia and its northern opposition to engage in meaningful negotiations that result in a pragmatic, enduring settlement; and

(6) urges the President and the Secretary of State to engage in direct, active discussions with the Soviet Union in order that the peaceful resolution of the crisis in Ethiopia becomes a high priority of both the United States and the Soviet Union, that external military flows to Ethiopia are reduced, and that the approach of the Soviet Union is consistent with that of the West,

(b) SANCTIONS.—The President is urged to use existing legal authorities to impose diplomatic and economic pressures upon the Government of Ethiopia if, after the enactment of this Act, the Government of Ethiopia fails to act in good faith to resolve its internal wars peacefully and to improve respect for internationally-recognized human rights.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not more than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and at the end of each 90 day period thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report describing the actions of the Ethiopian Government during the preceding 90 days with regard to its internal wars, human rights, and economic reform. Each such report shall describe the response of the United States to progress, or lack of progress, by the Government of Ethiopia in these critical areas.

Page 566, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 1031. APPLICATION OF PROVISION TO EARMARKED FUNDS FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 5303 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply with respect to the funds described in sections 1021 and 1022 of this title.

Page 582, line 7, strike out "made available to" and insert in lieu thereof "of".

Page 556, after line 5, insert the following new subsection (a):

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Friendship and longstanding interests bind the United States and Kenya.

(2) Kenya has a key role in promoting regional stability and addressing the humanitarian needs of the people of East Africa.

(3) The actions by the Government of Kenya in the past year to improve the human rights situation in Kenya have included the release of 16 political detainees, fewer political arrests and detentions, and progress in addressing the issue of police torture as demonstrated by President Moi's firing of several police officials in 1988, his public condemnation of the practice, and the conviction and imprisonment of 4 police officers.

(4) There continue to be important concerns regarding human rights abuses in Kenyan society.

Page 556, line 6, strike "(a)" and insert "(b)".

Page 556, line 21, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 557, line 3, strike "(a)" and insert "(b)".

Page 588, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE XV—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 1501. CONSIDERATIONS IN PROVIDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE.

Before providing foreign military financing and international military education and training under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal year 1990 or 1991 for any country, the President should take into account whether that country:

(1) receives from the Soviet Union more than three-quarters of the military assistance that it receives from foreign countries; or

(2) has more than 55 military personnel (serving in any capacity) from the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba, or any Soviet Bloc country.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Burton amendment regarding our policy toward South Africa. I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

I oppose the brutal, discriminatory, and inhuman policies of the apartheid regime in South Africa. Apartheid denies the majority of South Africans their inherent rights to liberty, equality, and freedom strictly because of the

color of their skin. For this reason I am advocating the policy statement of the Burton amendment. I hope the day will arrive soon when South Africans, regardless of race, will be afforded the full rights to which they are entitled, and yet are excluded from enjoying by the immoral apartheid regime which continues to oppress them. With that as our goal, our Government should adopt the most effective means possible to enable black South Africans to accomplish the establishment of a truly democratic government in South Africa. The Burton amendment, which states that our Government should pursue a policy of economically empowering the black majority in South Africa, offers the black South Africans what they need, a peaceful tool to bring about social and economic changes and eventually, full freedom.

This is precisely what black South Africans desire. A Gallup poll conducted recently in South Africa reveals that among blacks in that country, 82 percent believe United States economic sanctions against their country is a bad idea. The poll also showed that even more black South Africans, 85 percent, believe disinvestment is a poor response to apartheid. I submit that these people know better than we do what is best for them in their struggle against apartheid. These polls clearly show that the blacks in South Africa want foreigners to invest in their country. The reasons should be obvious to everyone. If the United States places even harsher sanctions on South Africa, blacks, not whites, will be the first to suffer the resulting poverty.

In our efforts to help the South African black majority change their government we should keep in mind the following facts. If the United States disinvests or enacts further sanctions, black South Africans will have three choices: first, continue to suffer from apartheid and poverty; or second, rise up and violently overthrow the white dominated government; or third, flee the country and become refugees. If any of these three options take place, black South Africans will suffer most and many will die for the agenda of Americans who believe they know what is best for nonwhite South Africans; despite the wishes of the very people they want to help. None of these options are viable or acceptable. International pressures have proven to cause the Government to only close ranks and become further isolated and unresponsive. In fact, it is highly likely that United States economic sanctions only serve the corporate interests of South African, white-owned, businesses.

For these reasons, I support a policy of black economic empowerment as an important step in removing apartheid in South Africa. Positive economic engagement in South Africa, which employs blacks and gives them skills and education to change their future, offers hope of bringing peaceful systemic change to South Africa by enabling blacks to become something more than a powerless, poor majority. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just note that the en bloc amendment on title X contains some language that I offered concerning Kenya. I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. WOLPE'S willingness to work out a compromise on this point.

It was important that some positive language about Kenya be included in the bill because Kenya is an important and valued friend of the United States.

Kenya, moreover, continues to play a constructive role in supporting stability in east Africa and in addressing the humanitarian needs of people throughout the east Africa region.

And yes, there are some concerns about the human rights situation within Kenya that warrant our concern. But it is also important to keep this vital relationship between our two countries alive and growing.

A "yes" vote on the Solomon amendment in this en bloc package softened negative language singling out America's foremost ally in east Africa—Kenya.

During the course of the last year Kenya has taken a leading role in Africa in the areas of hunger alleviation, environmental protection, and peacemaking. Kenya has also made much progress in addressing the concerns of Congress with regard to human rights.

Kenya has been instrumental in facilitating the international effort to feed the starving people in southern Sudan. Kenya has cooperated fully with United States efforts in this regard, and has contributed thousands of tons of grain to the feeding operations.

Parallel with American efforts, President Moi is playing a leading role in peacemaking throughout Africa—in Angoia, Mozambique, and Ethiopia.

Most recently Kenya unilaterally banned trade in ivory and ivory products as a means to halt the extinction of the African elephant. Kenya is leading the way in the international effort to preserve the African elephant as part of its extensive environmental protection program.

There are now no political prisoners in Kenya. A year ago 11 detainees were held under Kenya's preservation of public security act. Four detainees were released last year. In June 1989 Kenya released all remaining detainees.

To eliminate police brutality, President Moi fired several police officials in 1988, and publicly condemned police brutality on several occasions. More importantly, in March 1989, four police officers were convicted of torture and murder in the case of a murder suspect. The police officers were sentenced to prison terms of 15 to 20 years, and the case was widely reported in the Kenyan press.

Last December Kenya reestablished diplomatic relations with Israel—taking the lead among African countries. Kenya's courageous step in this regard is particularly important in the face of the PLO effort to gain participation in U.N. agencies.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we have included in an en bloc amendment compromises on four proposed amendments by my ranking minority member on the Africa Subcommittee, Congressman DAN BURTON.

Concerning South Africa, I strongly believe that an effective United States policy must contemplate diplomatic and economic pressures to raise the costs of apartheid to the South African regime. Yet I also believe that the United States should continue to assist disadvantaged South Africans in a way that is not complicit with apartheid structures and does not permit the evasion of United States sanctions law. The en bloc amendment modifies the proposed Burton amendment on United States policy in South Africa to make certain that these criteria for assistance, already found in the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, are followed scrupulously.

Concerning Angola, I am greatly encouraged by the latest developments in the region, including the recent meeting in Zaire between President Dos Santos of Angola and President Savimbi of the UNITA insurgency. This provides hope for a national reconciliation agreement that will end that tragic war. It is clear that it has been the withdrawal of external military forces—Cubans from the Angola side and South Africans from the UNITA side—that has provided a major impetus toward internal negotiations. In addition, African leaders, especially Presidents Mobutu of Zaire, Mugabe of Zimbabwe, Kaunda of Zambia, Sasso-Nugueso of Congo, Bongo of Gabon, and Houphouet-Boigny of Cote d'Ivoire, have effectively promoted national reconciliation. The en bloc amendment modifies the Burton amendment to pay special tribute to President Mobutu, who is now in this country on a state visit, for the key role he played in the Zaire summit. It also contains a sense of Congress that the United States could change its policy of nonrecognition of Angola and opposing aid to Angola by the IMF and World Bank if there is a national reconciliation agreement or the President determines that there has been significant progress toward such an agreement and the modification of existing policy would be in the best interests of the United States. I do not feel that the current U.S. policy of nonrecognition and opposition to multilateral aid has contributed to national reconciliation, I welcome the additional flexibility that this amendment provides on these issues.

Concerning Ethiopia, the en bloc amendment is based on the assumption that it is better to apply diplomatic and economic pressures upon the Ethiopian regime than to press for military assistance to opposition groups.This substitute for the original Burton amendment emphasizes scaling back external flows of military aid to Ethiopia—through urging active administration discussions with the Soviets—and upon raising United States diplomatic and economic pressure—including the threat of economic sanctions—upon Ethiopia to reform its state, improve human rights, and negotiate an end to its internal wars. If Ethiopia does make progress in these critical areas, the amendment encourages a resumption of assistance for development and reconstruction.

Concerning Mozambique, the en bloc amendment modifies the original Burton amendment by not insisting upon negotiations between the Government of Mozambique and RENAMO as a strict condition for United States assistance. That would associate us closely with a movement that engages in Khmer Rouge-style psychopathic violence. The substitute amendment instead stipulates that United States assistance should bear a

relation to the Government's continuing commitment to direct or indirect talks with RENAMO. This is the appropriate way of reinforcing the indirect discussions the Government has initiated with RENAMO in which the Government has signaled its willingness to introduce various reforms and pressed to clarify RENAMO's true goals and identify its leadership.

Concerning Kenya, in addition, we have reached a compromise with Congressman GERRY SOLOMON on Kenya which preserves the requirement that security assistance to Kenya be related to improvements in that country's human rights performance, but also incorporates reference to some specific positive steps that have recently occurred.

Finally, I am glad that, with the help of Chairman FASCELL, ranking minority member BILL BROOMFIELD, and my subcommittee ranking minority member DAN BURTON, we have been able, in this amendment, to protect a portion of the aid to sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region of the world, from possible pro-rata cuts on earmarked accounts.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Wolpe amendment which addresses the United States relationship with Ethiopia. I commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican for forging this bipartisan expression of Congress for the need for drastic reforms by the current regime. This amendment represents a broad-based policy initiative which addresses the challenges for the United States in the Horn of Africa.

The amendment carefully lays out the series of reforms and policy changes which must take place if an improvement in United States-Ethiopian relations is to occur. The current leadership in Ethiopia has failed miserably in its internal and external policies, and it is vitally important that we communicate in the clearest possible terms the sentiment in this Congress that major reforms must take place.

There are indications that the Government is beginning to consider more realistic options for confronting the myriad problems it faces by opening discussions with at least one of the rebel groups which is engaged in the war against the Government. But this is just a first step, and the United States must apply firm pressure on the Ethiopian Government to implement a series of reforms and policy changes for there to be progress in restoring stability to the Horn of Africa.

Among the outstanding issues which must be addressed are resolution of the internal wars, greater respect for the human rights of the Ethiopian people, economic reforms, and reunification of Ethiopian Jews whose families are now divided.

This final point is one of deep personal concern to me. There are thousands of families which remains divided as a result of the 1984 exodus of Ethiopian Jews who fled Ethiopia and were airlifted to Israel at that time. Since then, the Ethiopian Government has refused to permit a formalized program of family reunification to take place. Family reunification is a fundamental, internationally recognized principle which must be respected, and it will be difficult, if not impossible, to pursue a more productive relationship between the United States and Ethiopia until this issue, and the other needed reforms take place.

This amendment offers the possibility for reintroduction of assistance to Ethiopia for development and reconstruction, but also offers the possibility of pressures if these major internal and foreign policy obstacles are not adquately addressed. I believe this amendment is carefully crafted and provides both carrots and sticks.

The Ethiopian Government is put on notice that it can make choices which will help determine the course of relations with the United States. If the Government promotes certain reforms and upholds internationally recognized principles, relations with the United States should improve. If not, the President is urged to use his authority to apply economic and political pressure on the Ethiopian Government to prod them to make greater reforms.

I call on my colleagues to support this balanced approach to addressing the concern of Congress on the future of United States-Ethiopian relations.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my opposition to the provision in the en bloc amendment to title X of the foreign aid authorization bill which condemns Ethiopia for, among other things, various human rights violations, for its failure to negotiate an end to its civil war, and which recommends that the President impose economic sanctions against Ethiopia if that country does not resolve these problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned that this provision is counterproductive to the overtures President Mengistu has been making to end the war in his country and to improve the condition of human rights. I am afraid that we are sending a harmful signal to Ethiopia at this time.

I recently returned from Ethiopia and other countries in the Horn of Africa. While there, I had the opportunity to visit with President Mengistu and I know of his efforts to initiate peace negotiations. I also had the opportunity to observe first hand, Ethiopia's efforts, at great expense to its internal political stability not to mention the tremendous strain on its domestic food resources, to provide both refuge and food to the more than 800,000 Sudanese and Somalian refugees. In addition it was also playing a key role in the humanitarian assistance into the southern Sudan. There is no question that these efforts have resulted in the saving of many lives.

Ethiopia is at a very critical juncture in its political development. It sorely wants to upgrade its diplomatic relations with the United States and I believe now is the time to bring Ethiopia into our sphere of influence, not to castigate it with inflammatory language in this legislation.

Just last month, the Ethiopian Parliament adopted a peace plan that includes public negotiations with Eritrean insurgents in the presence of an international observer. Clearly, now is not the time to provide military assistance to resistance groups and thereby prolong the 28-year civil war. Nor is it the time to ignore the progress toward peace that has been made and continue to publicly condemn Ethiopia.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, all time has expired.

The question is on the en bloc amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 565, line 24, and page 566, line 1, strike out "not more than $3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "at least $9,000,000".

Page 566, strike out lines 3 through 6.

Page 566, line 7, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I have strong reservations about the money earmarked for countries in Africa. Although these are some of the poorest countries in the world, I strongly believe there must be some changes made in the way we dispense aid to these countries. They are simply not held accountable for the economic chaos they have created. Yet, they are still handed money by the United States without any questions asked. Many of my colleagues have railed against the changes which I feel are for the better in El Salvador, but they say nothing about the brutal repression that is part of the daily life in many countries in Africa. While we strive for economic changes in many other parts of the world, we continue to turn a blind eye toward the economic basket cases of the African Continent.

Not only is Zaire a country seeking economic truth, but even today fails to see the link between economic freedom and democratic pluralism.

Ethiopia turned to the Communist economic system in 1974 and we have seen the death and destruction of those policies on their people. Burkina Faso, whose ruthless repression is well documented by Amnesty International, receives aid from the United States through African Development Fund.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take these comments to heart. There are problems in the way we give aid to these countries and I ask the Members of this body to give a close look at these problems in the future.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am going to discuss I will withdraw in just

a moment, but I had an urgent reason to address the House, and that was the only way I could do it.

So, Mr. Chairman, we just received word a couple of days ago that in Ghana, the Government there has expelled a number of Protestant missionaries, and they closed down seven or eight churches, and these religious organizations have been contributing great assistance in the plight of the people in Ghana, and we certainly do not understand what the problem is.

The religious leaders for these various organizations have contacted us and indicated that they do not understand why their missionaries are being thrown out of the country.

We give Ghana about $25 million per year in economic assistance. I called the Ghanaian Ambassador and asked him to come to my office, because I am the ranking Republican on the Africa Subcommittee, to discuss this issue. He told me yesterday he would be in my office today to talk about this, but this morning, for some unknown reason, he had an emergency call from New York and had to leave the city.

He then said that he would have his deputy meet with me and Members of the Congress who are interested in this issue, and his deputy did not show up.

So I would like to take this opportunity to say that in conference there is a possibility that some action might be taken against Ghana. It may be that $5 million of their economic aid might be discussed as being cut because they will not at least talk to the United States about how these missionaries and these American churches are being treated.

All we want to do is to discuss this with Ghana, and I submit to my colleagues that if we are giving aid to countries like Ghana, they owe it to the United States of America, when Americans are being mistreated, especially missionaries who are doing a service there are being mistreated and expelled, they owe it to us to give us an explanation.

□ 1520

With that, I respectfully ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title X?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XI.

The text of title XI is as follows:

TITLE XI—AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE

SEC. 1101. PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) PAYMENT TERMS FOR FOREIGN CURRENCIES FOR PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES.—Section 106(a)(3) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that at least 40 percent of the amount due on such payment shall be made within 120 days after the delivery of the commodities involved, an additional 25 percent of such amount shall be paid by the end of the 1-year period after the first payment is due, and the remaining amount shall be paid by the end of the 1-year period after the second payment is due.".

(b) USE OF CURRENCIES FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS OF UNITED STATES.—Section 108 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (h), (i), and (j), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

"(g) Not to exceed 5 percent of the foreign currencies obtained for use under this section may be used to defray the costs to the United States Government of implementing this section.".

(c) COMPETITION WITH UNITED STATES PRODUCTS AND COMMODITIES.—

(1) SECTION 106 PROGRAM.—Section 106(b)(4)(B) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Such proceeds shall not be used to directly support any project or activity that is specifically designed to increase exports of any agricultural, textile, or apparel commodity from a developing country if such exports (i) would be in direct competition with United States exports, and (ii) can reasonably be expected to cause substantial injury to United States exporters of the same or substantially similar commodity.".

(2) SECTION 108 PROGRAM.—Section 108(c)(5) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) No currency made available under this section may be used to directly support any project or activity that is specifically designed to increase exports of any agricultural, textile, or apparel commodity from a developing country if such exports (A) would be in direct competition with United States exports, and (B) can reasonably be expected to cause substantial injury to United States exporters of the same or substantially similar commodity.".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title XI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XII.

The text of title XII is as follows:

TITLE XII—PEACE CORPS

SEC. 1201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 3(b) of the Peace Corps Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act $163,614,000 for the fiscal year 1990 and $170,322,000 for the fiscal year 1991.".

SEC. 1202. TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS.

Section 15 of the Peace Corps Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Technical publications produced by the Peace Corps may be sold at cost in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. Up to $200,000 of the proceeds of such sales in each fiscal year may, to such extent as may be provided in advance in appropriations Acts, be credited to the currently applicable appropriation of the Peace Corps, notwithstanding section 3302(b) of title 31, United States Code.".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title XII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XIII.

The text of title XIII is as follows:

TITLE XIII—UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON SOUTHERN AFRICA

SEC. 1301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "United States Commission on Southern Africa Act".

SEC. 1302. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) apartheid in South Africa has resulted in great disparities between whites and nonwhites, particularly in education, health care, employment opportunities, and availability of housing;

(2)(A) education is not compulsory for blacks in South Africa;

(B) a June 1988 report in the Weekly Mail states that more than a million black children between the ages of 7 and 16 (21 percent of the school age population) were not attending school in South Africa; in 1988 more than 21,000 black pupils were not admitted to schools in South Africa, while more than 23,000 spaces were vacant at white state schools; and

(C) despite crowded conditions at black schools, where the average teacher to pupil ratio in 1987 was 1 teacher to 38 students, as compared to 1 teacher to 19 students in white schools, more than 1,000 primary and secondary school teachers were refused posts at black schools, as stated in a June 1988 report in the Weekly Mail;

(3) black South Africans have far fewer medical professionals and health care services available to them than whites: white South Africans have 1 physician for every 326 people, while black South Africans have one physician for every 3,400 people; there are only 20 black dentists and 70 black pharmacists for a black population of 25,000,000; segregation in state hospitals has resulted in overcrowding in black hospitals, yet white hospitals have empty beds; budgets for white hospitals are higher than for black hospitals even though black hospitals have 4 times as many patients as white hospitals;

(4) unemployment among nonwhites in South Africa is high: the 1987 official unemployment rates were 17.9 percent for blacks and 14 percent for mixed-race (coloured), not including the homelands, and unemployment specialists in the country agree that the actual unemployment rate for blacks is higher than the official rate;

(5) 13,000 white South Africans currently hold civil service positions in Namibia; when Namibia becomes free and independent, the Government of Namibia will need skilled personnel to fill the positions vacated by white South Africans;

(6) there is a key role for concerned United States citizens and businesses in the private sector to assist in enhancing the development of human resources in southern Africa; and

(7) there is a need for the United States to assist in the development of human resources in southern Africa in the public and private sector, in order to improve in general the living conditions of nonwhites in South Africa, and lay the foundation for effective leadership in a democratic post-apartheid society in South Africa and Namibia.

SEC. 1303. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established the United States Commission on Southern Africa (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Commission"), which shall not be an agency or establishment of the Federal Government.

SEC. 1304. PURPOSE OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The purpose of the Commission is to solicit private sector funds to conduct programs to develop skilled personnel at various levels in the public and private sectors in South Africa and Namibia, particularly in middle management positions, by providing for the training of disadvantaged South Africans and Namibians, including refugees from South Africa in other countries, for positions in business and government in their respective countries, primarily in the fields of education, health care, law, and housing.

(b) AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out its purpose, the Commission may—

(1) establish, implement, and provide funds for human resource development programs for disadvantaged South Africans and Namibians, including educational and training programs in business and public administration, health care and the delivery of health care services, education, legal assistance, and housing; and

(2) provide scholarships and internships to disadvantaged South Africans and Namibians for appropriate study and training.

SEC. 1305. MEMBERSHIP; CHAIRPERSON.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members appointed from among persons who are not officers or employees of any government, as follows:

(1) 7 individuals appointed by the President, of whom not more than 4 shall be of the same political party.

(2) 1 individual appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 1 individual appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) 1 individual appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, and 1 individual appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.

A vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP.—If any member of the Commission becomes an officer or employee of a government, he or she may continue as such member for not longer than the 30-day period beginning on the date he or she becomes such an officer or employee.

(d) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms of 4 years. No member may serve consecutive terms.

(2) STAGGERED TERMS.—Of the members of the Commission first appointed by the President, 5 shall be appointed for terms of 2 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy on the Commission occurring before the expiration of the term for which his or her predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term. A member may serve after the expiration of his or her term until a successor has taken office.

(e) NON-FEDERAL CHARACTER AND PER DIEM.—Members of the Commission shall not, by reason of their membership on the Commission, be considered to be officers or employees of the United States. The members of the Commission shall receive no pay on account of their service on the Commission, except that, while away from their homes or regular places of business in performance of duties of the Commission, members of the Commission may be allowed travel and transportation expenses to the same extent as is authorized in section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for employees serving intermittently in the Government service.

(f) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall elect a chairperson from among its members. The chairperson shall serve for a term of 2 years.

(g) BYLAWS.—The Commission may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the conduct of its business.

SEC. 1306. PRESIDENT AND STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) PRESIDENT OF THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall appoint and fix the pay of the President of the Commission.

(b) STAFF.—Subject to such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, the President of the Commission may—

(1) appoint and fix the pay of such personnel, and

(2) procure the services of such experts and consultants,

as the President of the Commission considers appropriate.

(c) NON-FEDERAL CHARACTER.—The President and staff of the Commission shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the United States by reason of their service on the Commission.

SEC. 1307. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) GIFTS, BEQUESTS, AND DEVISES.—The Commission may solicit, accept, hold, administer, invest, and use gifts, bequests, and devises of money and property, both real and personal, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Money and property accepted pursuant to this subsection, and the proceeds thereof, shall be used as nearly as possible in accordance with the terms of the gift, bequest, or devise donating such money or property. Funds donated to and accepted by the Commission pursuant to this subsection are not to be regarded as appropriated funds and are not subject to any requirements or restrictions applicable to appropriated funds.

(b) AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT OUT.—In carrying out its purpose and activities, the Commission may enter into contracts with (to the extent that funds are available) and make grants to or obtain grants from State, local, and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals.

SEC. 1308. REQUIREMENTS.

(a) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds made available by the Commission for programs in South Africa may not be used for programs conducted by or through organizations in South Africa which are financed or controlled by the Government of South Africa, such as the "homeland" and "urban council" authorities. Such funds may only be used for programs which in both their character and organizational sponsorship in South Africa clearly reflect the objective of a majority of South Africans for an end to the apartheid system of separate development. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit programs which are consistent with this subsection and which award university scholarships to students who choose to attend a South African-supported university.

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

(c) INDEPENDENT AUDITS.—

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

(2) REPORT.—The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by section 1309. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Commission's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Commission's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

(d) AUDITS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) AUDITS.—The financial transactions of the Commission for each fiscal year may be audited by the Comptroller General of the United States in accordance with such principles and procedures and under such rules as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General. Any such audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Commission are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Commission pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit; and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with any assets held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers, and property of the Commission shall remain in the possession and custody of the Commission.

(2) REPORTS.—A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General considers necessary to inform the Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Commission, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General considers advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made contrary to the requirements of this title. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President and to the Commission at the time the report is submitted to the Congress.

(e) RECORDS OF RECIPIENTS.—

(1) RECORDS.—The Commission shall ensure that each recipient of assistance pro-

vided through the Commission under this title keeps separate accounts with respect to such assistance and such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(2) ACCESS TO RECORDS.—The Commission shall ensure that it, or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance provided through the Commission under this title. The Comptroller General of the United States or any authorized representative of the Comptroller General shall also have access to such books, documents, papers, and records for such purpose.

SEC. 1309. REPORT.

The Commission shall transmit to each House of the Congress, not later than December 31 of each year, a report on its activities during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 1310. FUNDS FROM DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

The Secretary of State shall grant to the Commission, to carry out this title, $1,000,000 of funds made available to the Department of State for any purpose for fiscal year 1990.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title XIII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XIV.

The text of title XIV is as follows:

TITLE XIV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 1401. CERTAIN USES OF EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO USE.—During fiscal year 1990, the Administrator for title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may use, for the purposes described in subsection (b), such sums of foreign currencies described in subsection (c) as the Administrator may determine.

(b) PURPOSES FOR WHICH CURRENCY MAY BE USED.—Foreign currencies may be used under this section—

(1) for the same purposes for which assistance may be provided under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and

(2) for the support of any institution providing education for a significant number of United States nationals (who may include members of the United States Armed Forces or the Foreign Service or dependents of such members).

(c) CURRENCIES WHICH MAY BE USED.—The foreign currencies which may be used under this section are United States-owned excess foreign currencies that are in excess of amounts necessary for satisfaction of preexisting commitments to use such currencies for other purposes specified by law.

(d) WHERE CURRENCIES MAY BE USED.—Foreign currencies may be used under this section in the country where such currencies are held or in other foreign countries.

(e) NONAPPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Foreign currencies may be used under this section notwithstanding section 1306 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

(f) LIMITATION.—Foreign currency made available under this section may not be used in any Communist country listed pursuant to section 4201(d).

SEC. 1402. MINORITY SET-ASIDE.

(a) SET-ASIDE REQUIREMENT.—Except to the extent that the Administrator for title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 determines otherwise, not less than 10 percent of the aggregate amounts made available for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for development assistance and assistance for famine recovery and development in Africa shall be made available only for activities of United States organizations and individuals that are—

(1) business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals,

(2) historically black colleges and universities,

(3) colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 40 percent of the students are Hispanic American, and

(4) private voluntary organizations which are controlled by individuals who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

(b) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to other actions taken to carry out this section, the actions described in paragraphs (2) through (5) shall be taken with respect to development assistance and assistance for famine recovery and development in Africa for fiscal years 1990 and 1991.

(2) CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in order to achieve the goals of this section, the Administrator—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, shall utilize the authority of section 8(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a));

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, shall enter into contracts with small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals—

(i) using less than full and open competitive procedures under such terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate, and

(ii) using an administrative system for justifications and approvals that, in the Administrator's discretion, may best achieve the purpose of this section; and

(C) shall issue regulations to require that any contract in excess of $500,000 contain a provision requiring that no less than 10 percent of the dollar value of the contract be subcontracted to entities described in subsection (a), except—

(i) to the extent the Administrator determines otherwise on a case-by-case or category-of-contract basis; and

(ii) this subparagraph does not apply to any prime contractor that is an entity described in subsection (a).

(3) NOTICE OF PROPOSED CONTRACTS.—Each person with contracting authority who is attached to administering agency's headquarters in Washington, as well as all agency missions and regional offices, shall notify the agency's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization at least 7 business days before advertising a contract in excess of $100,000, except to the extent that the Administrator determines otherwise on a case-by-case or category-of-contract basis.

(4) PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF MISSION DIRECTORS.—The Administrator shall include, as part of the performance evaluation of any mission director of the agency, the mission director's efforts to carry out this section.

(5) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Administrator shall submit to the Congress annual reports on the implementation of this section. Each such report shall specify the number and dollar value or amount (as the case may be) of prime contracts, subcontracts, grants, and cooperative agreements awarded to entities described in subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year.

(6) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall issue interim regulations to carry out this section within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and final regulations within 180 days after that date.

(c) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "socially and economically disadvantaged individuals" has the same meaning that term is given for purposes of section 133(c)(5) of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977, except that the term includes women.

SEC. 1403. REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH FOREIGN BOYCOTTS.

(a) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with other provisions of law, it is the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

(2) POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—It is further the policy of the United States to encourage the major trading nations of the world engaged in the export of goods or technology or other information to refuse to take actions, including furnishing information or entering into or implementing agreements, which have the effect of furthering or supporting the restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country or association of foreign countries against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Commerce shall issue an annual report detailing the extent to which members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade encourage actions, including the furnishing of information or entering into or implementing agreements, which have the effect of furthering or supporting boycotts fostered or imposed by any foreign country or association of foreign countries against a country friendly to the United States or against any United States person.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title XIV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment duly printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON:

Page 588, after line 7, insert the following new Section:

"SEC. 1404. MINERAL IMPORTS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the vital national interests and security of the United States would be jeopardized if the nation became dependent on communist countries as the sources for essential minerals and metals.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Every year after enactment of this Act, when the annual foreign assistance request is presented to Congress, the President shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate a report on the extent to which the United States is dependent on communist countries (as defined pursuant to Section 4201(d) of

the Foreign Assistance Act) as sources of supply and importation of—

(1) chromium,

(2) cobalt,

(3) manganese,

(4) platinum group metals,

(5) ferroalloys, and

(6) other strategic and critical materials (within the meaning of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act).

(2) The annual report submitted to Congress should also contain relevant information about what the United States is doing to reduce such dependence. The information may include such matters as stockpiling, conservation, the development of substitute materials, and the development of new and/or different deposits.".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a slightly condensed version of one I offered to the Foreign Aid Bill in 1987, which was accepted at that time by the committee. It simply states the sense of Congress that a dependence by the United States on Communist countries as sources for essential minerals and metals could jeopardize our national security. And it calls for an annual report, at the time when the foreign aid proposals are presented to Congress, on the extent to which the Nation is dependent on Communist countries for these minerals.

And so I offer this amendment in the hope that it will provide a useful tool in our annual deliberations on foreign policy issues.

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

Mr. Chairman, I inquire of the gentleman from New York: Is this the dependency amendment?

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct; it is.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment, and we think it is a helpful amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the Solomon amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 588, after line 7, add the following new Section:

"SEC. 1404. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the amounts authorized for activities under this Act are reduced by a further 5%."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 6, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] controls the 5 minutes since he printed the amendment in the RECORD. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was called up by our colleague, Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of debate.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have been here now going on my third term. I voted to cut education, at least I could have voted, and I have been castigated at times because they say, "Traficant, we have a great deficit and you don't want to make any cuts."

We had programs dealing with school lunch, child nutrition, senior citizens, infrastructure money for America, for our roads, for our bridges, and some people said, "Traficant, you are just a big spender, you don't want to make any cuts."

Today I am offering to the Congress an opportunity to cut $575 million in foreign aid money that is being targeted to go overseas.

Now it is not an easy vote. This amendment treats everybody the same. My amendment cuts everybody 5 percent. But while you wrestle with the politics and the pressure of it, keep in mind that America has had to do with less. We are now disciplined by a so-called Gramm-Rudman law because our deficits, budget deficits annually cannot be controlled. But we have a bill before us with a 7 percent real increase over last year. All we have targeted for this year for education is a 2-percent increase. I do not buy that.

Someone is going to have to make some cuts, and I will tell you what, I am not going to vote to cut Americans if we are going to continue to increase money for people overseas.

Maybe there is no one listening around here, but we have some senior citizens in this country who are eating dog food. I am not being dramatic. That is a fact. We have kids who are graduating from high school who cannot read. We are cutting back education programs in America.

I agree we have to bite the bullet, but I will tell you this, if we are going to bite the bullet for the funds that deal with American people, it should be a law that we cannot bite that bullet before we cut that foreign aid appropriation and authorization.

That is what I am here for.

I have lost an awful lot of jobs and I do not want to see my taxpayers' limited dollars which could best be used in my area going overseas.

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the 5-percent cut. Mr. Chairman, I would have supported a 10-percent cut also.

Let me say this: Can you imagine here we are, the United States is $2.8 trillion, nearing $3 trillion in deficit, we are paying $175 billion interest on it each year. We have got $130 billion trade deficit. We are a debtor Nation to the tune of $550 billion.

We have good jobs, manufacturing jobs which have gone overseas. We have millions of people underemployed living on low wages. We have millions of people who are unemployed. We have people living at lower quality of life. We have 38 million people without health insurance. We have hundreds of thousands of homeless. We have communities who want to take care of their infrastructure, who need sewers, water, bridges. Yet here we are going to ask the American taxpayer to cough up more bucks to send over to help another country with their foreign military bases and their economy so that they can turn around and send it back into the United States to compete for our jobs. There is something wrong; it makes no sense, and I say this cut will only be a small nick in the foreign ship of money.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FASCELL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Traficant amendment and I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FASCELL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE XV—COMPLIANCE WITH BUDGET RESOLUTION

SEC. 1501. REDUCTION OF AGGREGATE AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED BY THIS ACT.

Notwithstanding the specific authorizations of appropriations in the preceding provisions of this Act (including the amendments made by this Act), the aggregate amount appropriated for fiscal year 1990 pursuant to those authorizations may not exceed $11,236,407,000.

□ 1530

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the Traficant amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Is there an opponent that could be recognized for this particular amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the substitute is not separately debatable.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the aggregate amount that may be appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in the pending legislation, and this cut amounts to $328,557,000, and the bottom line of this amendment is, it brings it in conformity with the budget resolution and therefore, since they established both the ceiling and a floor for the 150 function, this cut represents a maximum amount that can be deducted from the bill without limiting the Committee on Appropriations' ability to remain consistently within the budget agreement.

We bring to the floor a bill which was consistent with the administration's request. This amendment now brings Members a bill, and I hope it will be supported unanimously. It only goes part way to the gentleman's purpose, who was the original sponsor of the basic amendment, but it goes a long way also. It brings this bill, now, in conformity with the budget agreement so that we have no questions with regard to the level of the authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the ranking Republican.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the chairman in urging my colleagues to support this amendment which would cut over $328 million from the overall price tag of this bill. This action is fully consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement and brings the funding authority levels provided by this bill into line with the amount allocated for the foreign aid appropriations measure.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this bill are, by and large, very close to the funding levels requested by the President. However, we all recognize the harsh budget environment in which we find ourselves, and the many demands placed on the Federal budget. I think Chairman FASCELL's approach is a reasonable one. It is important that we adequately fund those programs that support our foreign and national security policy goals and objectives. However, we must balance this need with the requirement to adhere to the Gramm-Rudman budget levels. This amendment results in the achievement of both of these objectives and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is indicative of a very fair chairman to give his opponent time to speak on his amendment, when it is a limited time.

This would be an increase of $425 million over last year, and this is not across the board.

Now I want to say this in the House today, and I guess that maybe the House is a little silent at this point. I think we have real good friends and some people do not like to cut those friends. Some of those friends have real good strong arms, politically, and God bless them, they have to survive.

However, we have a massive defense budget, and we can provide some defense contractors for our friends. However, I think that Congress should make more of a cut in the foreign aid category.

Now, I am going to vote "No" on the substitute, and I am going to ask for a vote on the 5 percent across the board. Members can go ahead and do what they want to do.

I have great respect for a very fine chairman, and I thank the gentleman for giving the opponent time. I think it speaks for the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, just to close my remarks with regard to this, just to say that this cut is a substantial cut. The purpose is to bring this bill within the context of the budget agreement or any entered into.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 12, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—406

Ackerman	Barton	Boucher
Akaka	Bateman	Boxer
Alexander	Bates	Brennan
Anderson	Bellenson	Brooks
Andrews	Bennett	Broomfield
Annunzio	Bereuter	Browder
Anthony	Berman	Brown (CA)
Archer	Bevill	Brown (CO)
Armey	Bilbray	Bruce
Aspin	Bilirakis	Buechner
Atkins	Bliley	Bunning
AuCoin	Boehlert	Burton
Baker	Boggs	Bustamante
Ballenger	Bonior	Byron
Barnard	Borski	Callahan
Bartlett	Bosco	Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)	Hancock	Michel
Cardin	Hansen	Miller (CA)
Carper	Harris	Miller (OH)
Carr	Hastert	Miller (WA)
Chandler	Hatcher	Mineta
Clarke	Hawkins	Moakley
Clay	Hayes (IL)	Molinari
Clement	Hayes (LA)	Mollohan
Clinger	Hefley	Montgomery
Coble	Hefner	Moody
Coleman (MO)	Henry	Moorhead
Coleman (TX)	Herger	Morella
Combest	Hertel	Morrison (CT)
Conte	Hiler	Morrison (WA)
Conyers	Hoagland	Mrazek
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Murtha
Costello	Holloway	Myers
Coughlin	Horton	Nagle
Cox	Houghton	Natcher
Coyne	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Craig	Hubbard	Neal (NC)
Crane	Huckaby	Nelson
Crockett	Hughes	Nielson
Darden	Hunter	Nowak
Davis	Hutto	Oakar
de la Garza	Hyde	Oberstar
DeFazio	Inhofe	Olin
DeLay	Ireland	Ortiz
Dellums	James	Owens (NY)
Derrick	Jenkins	Owens (UT)
DeWine	Johnson (CT)	Oxley
Dickinson	Johnson (SD)	Packard
Dicks	Johnston	Pallone
Dingell	Jones (GA)	Panetta
Dixon	Jontz	Parker
Donnelly	Kanjorski	Parris
Dorgan (ND)	Kaptur	Pashayan
Dornan (CA)	Kasich	Patterson
Douglas	Kennedy	Paxon
Downey	Kennelly	Payne (NJ)
Dreier	Kildee	Payne (VA)
Duncan	Kleczka	Pease
Durbin	Kolbe	Pelosi
Dwyer	Kolter	Penny
Dymally	Kostmayer	Perkins
Dyson	Kyl	Petri
Early	LaFalce	Pickett
Eckart	Lagomarsino	Pickle
Edwards (CA)	Lancaster	Porter
Edwards (OK)	Lantos	Poshard
Emerson	Laughlin	Price
Engel	Leach (IA)	Pursell
English	Leath (TX)	Quillen
Erdreich	Lehman (CA)	Rangel
Espy	Lehman (FL)	Ravenel
Evans	Leland	Regula
Fascell	Lent	Rhodes
Fawell	Levin (MI)	Richardson
Fazio	Levine (CA)	Ridge
Feighan	Lewis (CA)	Rinaldo
Fields	Lewis (FL)	Ritter
Fish	Lewis (GA)	Roberts
Flake	Lightfoot	Robinson
Flippo	Lipinski	Roe
Foglietta	Livingston	Rogers
Ford (MI)	Lloyd	Rohrabacher
Ford (TN)	Long	Rose
Frank	Lowery (CA)	Rostenkowski
Frenzel	Lowey (NY)	Roukema
Frost	Luken, Thomas	Rowland (CT)
Gallegly	Lukens, Donald	Rowland (GA)
Gallo	Machtley	Roybal
Gaydos	Madigan	Russo
Gejdenson	Manton	Sabo
Gekas	Markey	Saiki
Gephardt	Marlenee	Sangmeister
Gibbons	Martin (IL)	Sarpalius
Gillmor	Martin (NY)	Savage
Gilman	Martinez	Sawyer
Gingrich	Matsui	Saxton
Glickman	Mavroules	Schaefer
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Scheuer
Goodling	McCandless	Schiff
Gordon	McCloskey	Schneider
Goss	McCollum	Schroeder
Gradison	McCrery	Schuette
Grandy	McCurdy	Schulze
Grant	McDade	Schumer
Gray	McEwen	Sensenbrenner
Green	McGrath	Sharp
Guarini	McHugh	Shaw
Gunderson	McMillan (NC)	Shays
Hall (OH)	McMillen (MD)	Shumway
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Shuster
Hamilton	Meyers	Sikorski
Hammerschmidt	Mfume	Sisisky

Skaggs	Stark	Volkmer
Skeen	Stearns	Vucanovich
Skelton	Stenholm	Walgren
Slattery	Stokes	Walker
Slaughter (NY)	Studds	Walsh
Slaughter (VA)	Sundquist	Watkins
Smith (FL)	Synar	Waxman
Smith (MS)	Tallon	Weber
Smith (NE)	Tanner	Weiss
Smith (NJ)	Tauke	Weldon
Smith (TX)	Tauzin	Wheat
Smith (VT)	Thomas (CA)	Whittaker
Smith, Denny (OR)	Thomas (GA)	Whitten
	Thomas (WY)	Williams
Smith, Robert (NH)	Torres	Wise
	Torricelli	Wolf
Smith, Robert (OR)	Towns	Wolpe
	Traxler	Wyden
Snowe	Udall	Wylie
Solarz	Unsoeld	Yates
Spence	Upton	Yatron
Spratt	Valentine	Young (AK)
Staggers	Vander Jagt	Young (FL)
Stallings	Vento	
Stangeland	Visclosky	

NOES—12

Applegate	Jones (NC)	Roth
Dannemeyer	Kastenmeier	Solomon
Hopkins	Murphy	Stump
Jacobs	Rahall	Traficant

NOT VOTING—14

Bentley	Florio	Smith (IA)
Bryant	Garcia	Swift
Chapman	McDermott	Wilson
Collins	Obey	Wright
Courter	Ray	

□ 1554

Mr. APPLEGATE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. OLIN and Mr. DYMALLY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey: Page 588, after line 7, add the following:

SEC. 1404. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ROMANIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania continues its flagrant abuse of the human rights of its citizens, including the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech and press, and the rights of ethnic minorities;

(2) Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu has refused to renounce his plan for forced relocation of Romania's populations into "agro-industrial complexes", and has begun to obliterate as many as half of the country's 13,000 rural villages, thereby systematically destroying family homes, churches and synagogues, and private sources of food;

(3) the people of Romania continue to be harassed and arrested for their religious activities, and houses of worship have been destroyed by government authorities, such as the demolition on May 31, 1989, of the Comanesti Baptist Church near Bacau;

(4) Hungarian, German, and other ethnic minorities have been subjected to a campaign of forced assimilation, including severe restrictions on the use of their own languages in education and on other cultural expressions;

(5) President Ceausescu's economic policies have been formulated to greatly accelerate the repayment of Romania's foreign debt by raising Romania's level of exports and sharply curtailing imports, thereby causing severe shortages of basic food staples and items such as meat, fruit, and vegetables, and requiring the strict rationing of household energy; and

(6) the United States imports certain food products from Romania, such as boned pork, grape wine, and cheese.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States should impose sanctions against all food and agricultural products of the Socialist Republic of Romania; and

(2) the President should consult with allied countries to develop a coordinated policy to impose sanctions against Romania, particularly sanctions against food and agricultural products of Romania.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a quick statement about where we are. We are on the last title, Mr. Chairman. We have three amendments. This is one of the three. I am not sure, but I believe the amendments have been worked out.

We would then, as I understand it, still have a possibility of a substitute that is not going to be offered, and we have a motion to recommit—excuse me; I am trying to find out—does the gentleman have four amendments?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. He has four amendments on this side.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] for yielding.

We have four amendments. We think they are worked out, I hope. We then would have a motion to recommit and final passage, and then we would be through with this.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today recognizes and deplores the ongoing violations of human rights by the Government of Romania against its citizenry, including its mistreatment of ethnic Hungarians.

The amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should impose limited sanctions against Romanian exports—specifically food and agricultural products—and that the President should consult with our allies to develop a coordinated policy of sanctions.

While the sanctions suggested in the amendment constitute only a fraction of the commerce between the United States and Romania—about $15 million in 1988—it nevertheless, sends a clear, nonambiguous signal to the Ceausescu regime that his government's abuses against the people will not be tolerated, and must cease.

Romania's food exports, including pork, wine, and cheese, are targeted for banning precisely because Ceausescu has been exporting the very staples necessary to feed the Romanian people. Bucharest's obsession with the acquisition of hard currency to wipe out Romania's foreign debt has imposed severe food shortages and deprivation to the people. In what could—and should—be a land of plenty, Europe's grainery, if you will, is today a place of extreme scarcity.

In recent years, Mr. Chairman, the methodical repression by the Romanian Government—especially its ruthless secret police, the securitate—has become increasingly apparent to all including other Communist governments in the region.

In early March, Hungary took the unprecedented action in cosponsoring a Swedish resolution considered by the U.N. Human Rights Commission to authorize the appointment of a special rapporteur to investigate Romanian human rights abuses. The rapporteur's report is due during the 46th session of the U.N. Human Rights Conference in 1990.

A March 15, 1989, editorial in the New York Times criticizing Ceausescu began this way:

> East Europeans have taken to calling Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu the Idi Amin of Communism. He has squandered billions on grandiose public works that don't work, and has left many of his people hungry and freezing in half-darkened homes.

Even the Soviet Union has criticized the Romanian Government. According to the Washington Post, October 6, 1988, Gorbachev personally warned Ceausescu concerning his government's behavior. The story, written by Michael Dobbs said in part:

> In an unusually blunt luncheon address, the Kremlin chief made it clear that he is disturbed by economic mismanagement and human rights violations in Romania. He

said that the failings of any socialist country could bring discredit on the entire Communist system.

Also of significance, and worth noting here, is the fact that the U.S.S.R., East Germany, and Bulgaria broke with customary Warsaw Pact solidarity and abstained from voting on the U.N. resolution calling for appointment of the rapporteur for Romania.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the human rights violations in Romania are legion and have been documented beyond any reasonable doubt by numerous NGO's, the United States State Department, and the Helsinki Commission, of which I am a member.

Other nations, Mr. Chairman, likewise, are expressing their concern over Romania's poor human rights performance. Great Britain, for example, has frozen all high-level government-to-government contacts. Germany has canceled economic meetings with Romania and scientific cooperation between the two countries and have frozen high-level contacts. The European Community has suspended talks regarding economic arrangements with Romania.

France, for its part, has recalled its ambassador in reaction to Ceausescu's retaliation against six prominent former Romanian leaders who criticized the government's policy. The six, including two former members of the Communist Party Politburo and a former minister of foreign affairs, said:

MR. PRESIDENT NICOLAE CEAUSESCU: At a time when the very idea of socialism, for which we have fought, is discredited by your policy, and when our country is being isolated in Europe, we have decided to speak up. We are perfectly aware that by doing so we are risking our liberty and even our life, but we feel duty-bound to appeal to you to reverse the present course before it is too late.

The international community is reproaching you for the non-observance of the Helsinki Final Act which you have signed yourself. Romanian citizens are reproaching you the non-observance of the Constitution on which you have sworn. Here are the facts:

(a) The whole plan for systematization of villages and the forced removal of peasants to three-story apartment blocks run against Article 36 of the Constitution which protects the right to personal property of a household, with annexes and the terrain on which they are situated.

(b) The decree forbidding Romanian citizens to have contact with foreigners has never been voted by the legislative body and never published, thus lacking legal power. And yet our citizens are threatened to be fired, harassed, arrested and sentenced on that basis.

(c) The civic center, the biggest multi-billion lei investment of Romania has no public budget and is being built against all existing laws regulating constructions and their financing. The cost of that immense building has tripled because of changes you are ordering every month in the interior and exterior of the building.

(d) Securitatea, which we created to defend the socialist order against exploiting classes, is now directed against workers demanding their rights, against old members of the party and honest intellectuals exercising their right to petition (Article 34) and freedom of speech (Article 28) guaranteed by the Constitution.

(e) Factories and institutions are ordered to force their employees to work on Sundays against Article 19 of the Constitution and the Labour Code.

(f) Mail is systematically violated and our telephone conversations cut-off against Article 34 guaranteeing their privacy. To sum-up, the constitution is virtually suspended and there is no legal system in force. You must admit, Mr. President, that a society can not function if the authorities, starting from the top, show disrespect for the law.

Planning no longer works in the Romanian economy. The meetings of the executive political committee are all past-oriented, exhorting the workers to make up for the unfulfilled plan of previous year, previous semester or previous month. An increasing number of factories lack raw materials, energy or markets.

Agricultural policy is also in disarray. Harsh administrative measures are directed against the peasants who, according to your own date, provide 40 percent of vegetables, 56 percent fruits, 60 percent milk and 44 percent meats, though they have only 12 percent of the arable land. But, of course, predominant in the villages is now the fear of being "systematized" with seven or eight thousand villages threatened to be razed. Above all economic, cultural and humanitarian objections of the civilized world to that program, a legitimate question arises: Why urbanize villages when you cannot ensure decent conditions of urban life in the cities, namely heating, lighting, transportation, not to mention food. A government which five winters in a row is unable to solve such vital problems for the population proves incompetent and inept to govern. Therefore, we are not pressing on you any demand in this respect.

The very fact that Germans, Hungarians and Jews are emigrating en masse shows that the policy of forced assimilation should be renounced.

Finally, we are deeply worried that Romania's international position and prestige is rapidly deteriorating. As you know, this is concretely shown by the decision of quite a few states to close their embassies in Bucharest. Most alarming, embassies of such European states as Norway, Denmark and Portugal have already left and others may follow. Our growing isolation affects not only diplomatic relations. We have lost the American clause for trade and as a result some of our textile factories have no orders. The E.E.C. is unwilling to extend its trade agreement with Romania, which will negatively affect other sectors of our economy.

You have always maintained that summit meetings are decisive in improving interstate relations. But how are you going to improve Romania's external relations when all the leaders of the non-communist nations of Europe refuse to meet with you. Romania is and remains a European country and as such must advance with the Helsinki process and not turn against it. You started changing the geography of the countryside, but you cannot remove Romania to Africa.

To stop the negative processes, both domestic and international, besetting our nation we appeal to you, as a first step, to take the following measures:

(a) To state categorically in unequivocal terms that you have renounced the plan of systematization of villages.

(b) To restore the constitutional guarantees regarding the rights of citizens. This will enable you to observe the decisions of the Vienna Conference on Human Rights.

(c) To put an end to food exports which are threatening the biological existence of our nation.

Once such measures were taken, we are prepared to participate in a constructive spirit in a dialogue with the government on the ways and means to overcome the present impasse.

Gheorghe Apostol, Former Member of Politburo and Chairman of Trade Unions; Alexandru Birladeanu, Former Member of Politburo and Chairman of Planning Committee; Cornel Manescu, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs and President of U.N. General Assembly; Constantin Privulescu, Founding Member of the Communist Party; I. Raceanu, Veteran of the Communist Party; Silviu Brucan, Former Acting Editor of "Scinteia."

Mr. Chairman, the latest assault on individual rights in Romania is Ceausescu's systematization program—a bizarre program with the goal of destroying up to half of Romania's approximately 13,000 villages and forcibly resettling their population into concrete-block "agro-industrial centers."

Because of government repression some 20,000 Romanian citizens have taken refuge in neighboring Hungary. A grave humanitarian problem has arisen in connection with these refugees: Many have left close family members—spouses, children, and parents—behind in Romania with little hope of family reunification in the near future. Other Romanian citizens have fled at great personal risk to Yugoslavia.

Romanian authorities have recently constructed a barbed-wire fence, fortified by deep ditches and a restricted border zone, on the border with Hungary, in an attempt to stem the tide of desperate refugees fleeing their homeland. In a highly unusual and welcome move, Soviet officials condemned the Romanians' construction of the fence last Friday.

In addition to unjustly imprisoned prisoners of conscience, many hundreds of Romanian citizens are in prison for attempting to cross the border illegally. A Baptist activist, Nestor Popescu, has been incarcerated in a psychiatric hospital since attempting to exercise his freedom of conscience and expression.

Mr. Chairman, the Romanian regime violates the rights of religious believers, national minority members, would-be emigrants, and all who seek to exercise their right to freedom of expression.

On May 31, authorities demolished the Comanesti Baptist Church in retaliation for so-called zoning violations

after arresting the pastor and two elders. The pastor was later released.

On June 20, authorities arrested human rights activist Eva Gyimesi for hoarding food and remains under house arrest. Recently, authorities brutally beat her good friend, the courageous and outspoken activist, Doina Cornea, who has been living under house arrest for several months.

I am also gravely concerned over the fate of several journalists, typesetters, and printers from the newspaper Romania Libera. They were detained in late January, accused of printing antiregime pamphlets. Their whereabouts and conditions are unknown.

Romania's repressive domestic policies are mirrored in its cynical approach to the international commitments it has undertaken. In January 1989, the regime signed onto the Vienna Concluding Document, then announced that it would abide only by those commitments it did not find objectionable. It rejected the U.N. Human Rights Commission resolution passed last March and has rejected the attempts of several C.S.C.E. member state representatives to use the new human dimension "mechanism" to raise several human rights cases.

In the face of Western criticism at two recent meetings held under the aegis of the 35-country conference on security and cooperation in Europe, Romania has returned to the timeworn and untenable defense of its abysmal record by claiming that "outsiders" have no right to "interfere" in a sovereign country's internal affairs.

This amendment deserves the support of the House, and sends a clear message to Romania to clean up its act.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the amendment sponsored by my good friend, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

While we have all been appalled by the recent tragic events in China, there have been equally tragic events taking place in Romania which deserve the Congress' condemnation.

The Government of Romania, despite moves toward democratization and freedom elsewhere in Eastern Europe, continues to violate the most basic human rights of its citizens.

The people of Romania suffer under religious persecution. Many have been imprisoned for their religious beliefs, and houses of worship have been demolished.

The Ceausescu regime's harsh economic policies include the elimination of many rural villages, and the sharp curtailment of exports, resulting in widespread shortages of basic goods and the destruction of family homes.

We here in the Congress should send a strong signal to Romania that the United States will not do business with them until there is an end to these cruel measures imposed on the Romanian people.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this important amendment with regard to human rights abuses in Romania offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I commend Mr. SMITH for his leadership in the struggle for the protection of human rights, both in Romania and around the world.

The continuing violations of human rights by the Government of Romania against its citizenry, necessitates the implementation of this amendment. Congress must make every effort to protect the most basic human rights including the right to one's religious beliefs, the right to emigrate, and the right to the freedom of expression. Romania's violation of these rights are extensive and well-documented by our State Department and by the Helsinki Commission.

Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu's program of systemization, which would obliterate almost 13,000 rural villages and forcibly relocate the population into "agro-industrial complexes," is the latest infringement upon the individual rights of the Romanian people.

The United States has always been a leader in protecting the basic human rights of people around the world. We must join our fellow nations in expressing our concern over the Romanian's poor human rights record. This amendment expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should impose agricultural sanctions against Romania. We must also urge the President to coordinate with our allies a policy which would require Romanian authorities to respect the rights of her people. These sanctions are necessary, and we must act quickly to help the citizens of Romania who desperately need our assistance.

□ 1600

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT] in praising the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member for what I think is a very good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am again requesting support for the foreign aid authorization, H.R. 2655, in its final passage. I commend to you for your consideration the following aspects of the bill:

I. CHAPTER 2 OF TITLE VI—THE CARIBBEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT (MR. CROCKETT)

(a) Emphasis on promoting self-reliance with the specific involvement of the poor and women in development.

(b) Earmarking no less than $33,250,000 each fiscal year to be available only for the Eastern Caribbean and Belize.

(c) Insisting on specific action by the Government of Haiti in fostering and implementing a full and democratic society in which the Haitian people can prosper.

II. TITLE X—AFRICA (MR. WOLPE)

(a) The African Famine Recovery and Development Act—The critical role of women in development, the development of indigenous PVOs.

(b) An increase for FY 90 in Development Assistance at the expense of Economic Support Fund (See below).

	In millions
Development Assistance	580.0
African Development Foundation	10.0
Economic Support Fund	53.0
Military Assistance (equipment)	41.0
Military Training	11.2

(c) Rep. WOLPE's amendment to protect the $103 million earmarked for aid to sub-Saharan Africa from reductions, if reductions become necessary.

III. TITLE XIII—U.S. COMMISSION ON SOUTHERN AFRICA (MR. DYMALLY)

To establish a U.S. Commission on Southern Africa to solicit private funds to train middle management level South Africans and Namibians for positions in business and government.

IV. TITLE XIV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1402—minority set-aside: Not less than 10 percent of the aggregate amounts available for fiscal years 1990 and 1991 for development assistance and assistance for famine recovery and development in Africa to be made available for activities of U.S. organizations and individuals that are minorities.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, we have examined this amendment. We agree with the gentleman from New Jersey and we are happy to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which would express the sense of the Congress that the United States should impose sanctions on Romania to prohibit the importation to the United States of all food and agricultural products. The amendment further urges President Bush to consult the allies in Western Europe to develop a coordinated—and thus more effective—policy for sanctions on Romania.

The Romanian Government of President Nicolae Ceausescu gives no indication of ending its repressive poli-

cies—including systematic human rights violations and a plan to repay the Romanian debt on the backs of the Romanian people. By increasing exports and sharply curtailing imports, the Government that once presided over Eastern Europe's bread basket has imposed cronic food and household fuel shortages on the Romanian people.

Any internal opposition to President Ceausescu is considered a criminal offense and is treated accordingly.

Romanian dissident Doina Cornea has been beaten and placed under house arrest for releasing an open letter critical of Ceausescu's policies.

The fate of four Romanian journalists who attempted to publish criticism of Ceausescu is still not known.

Six former loyal Romanian officials, including Communist Party members, were suppressed in attempting to criticize Ceausescu and confined under house arrest.

On May 31, the Comanesti Baptist Church near the town of Bacau was bulldozed by the Government despite the appeals of its pastor and its congregation and even an unusual defense by Romania's normally quiet Baptist hierarchy. The church's leadership was arrested, but subsequently released. However, this congregation, like many others, remains under constant threat.

Romania apparently even erected a barbed-wire fence across its Hungarian border to try to prevent Romanian citizens, particularly ethnic Hungarians, from fleeing to Hungary. A campaign of forced assimilation toward Romania's Hungarian minority has caused the first mass exodus from one Communist country to another, Hungary, which reportedly happens to be tearing down its Iron Curtain with Austria.

The Romanian regime has systematically flouted its own international human rights commitments.

Witness the Romanian Government's statement after signing the Vienna Concluding Document last January that it would only selectively comply with the Helsinki accords document's human rights provisions.

One month later, the Romanian Government denounced the decision by the United Nations Human Rights Commission to establish a special rapporteur to investigate Romania's human rights conditions, and it has yet to indicate any forthcoming cooperation.

Not surprisingly, the official Romanian tune remained unchanged in Paris, where United States negotiators to the Helsinki followup Conference on the Human Dimension heard the Romanian delegate "reject categorically the totally baseless allegations regarding economic, social, and political realities" in their country.

Mr. Chairman, we have come very close to exhausting every diplomatic lever for achieving Romanian compliance with its own human rights commitments. Already the European Community has suspended talks over renewing a trade agreement with Romania.

The Smith amendment deplores human rights abuses in Romania and expresses the sense of Congress that the United States should impose limited sanctions aginst Romanian exports, specifically food and agricultural products.

Why take action against Romania now?

Bucharest's obsession with the acquisition of hard currency to wipe out Romania's foreign debt has imposed severe food shortages and deprivation to its people. Food is unnecessarily scarce in Romania.

Other countries have taken recent action against Romania. Great Britain has frozen all high-level government-to-government contacts. Germany has canceled economic meetings with Romania and scientific cooperation between the two countries. France has recalled its Ambassador. The European Community has suspended economic talks with Romania. The United Nations has appointed a special rapporteur to investigate Romanian human rights abuses. Hungary took the unprecedented action of cosponsoring the U.N. resolution while the rest of the Warsaw Pact broke with Romania and abstained from the vote. Soviet leader Gorbachev has publicly criticized and warned Ceausescu for human rights violations.

Ceausescu presses on with his program of systemization hoping to destroy nearly 13,000 villages and force cruel relocation of Romanian families.

Some 20,000 Romanian citizens have taken refuge in neighboring Hungary, leaving family members behind.

Romanian officials have recently constructed a barbed-wire fence, reminiscent of the Berlin Wall, to try to stop refugees.

Beatings, arrests, and harassment continue for anyone who questions Ceausescu. Even former Communist leaders have been placed under house arrest for their criticism of Ceausescu.

The United States cannot remain silent while so many others have spoken out against Romania's deplorable human rights record. Vote yes and vote in favor of improved human rights for Romanians.

I urge support of this amendment, which would be a sense of the Congress, and would represent a very, very small percentage of overall United States imports from Romania. This is an important and necessary signal to place pressure on the Romanian Government, and perhaps even to assist the Romanian people by working with the administration to embargo edible food products from Romania.

It is high time for the United States and its allies to take at least an initial step to stand with the Romanian people.

All in free world, let Romanian people know we care—Radio Free Europe.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Helsinki Commission.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me and congratulate him for introducing this amendment.

There is no doubt that Romania has shown itself to be the principal violator of the human rights of its citizens within the community of nations in Helsinki. I think this is a very appropriate amendment that sends a strong signal, and I certainly support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, just one final comment. This amendment does send that clear signal to the Romanians, even those Communists in the East bloc countries, including Hungary, which have been criticizing the Romanian Government and Ceausescu. I think this is a worthy amendment and hope that my colleagues will suppport it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XIV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 588, add the following after line 7;

SEC. 1404. UNITED NATIONS VOTE ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN CUBA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—The United States expresses its deepest displeasure and disappointment with those countries who voted against the United States and with Cuba at the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva in March of 1989 on the resolution proposed by Panama to curb the United Nations investigation of human rights abuses in Cuba. This was a vote crucial to United States interests and reflected the attitudes of these countries with respect to human rights and friendship with the United States.

(b) LIST OF COUNTRIES.—The countries referred to in subsection (a) are Botswana, Bulgaria, the People's Republic of China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, India, Iraq, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, the Ukranian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and Yugoslavia.

(c) DEDUCTION OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—Any foreign assistance otherwise authorized

to be made available under this Act for fiscal year 1990 for any country listed in subsection (b) shall be reduced by 50 percent.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, over a year ago after a big fight in Geneva, the U.N. Human Rights Commission was given authority to investigate human rights abuses in Cuba, and for 1 year the investigation took place, but then on March 31, 1989, a day which will live in infamy in Geneva at the second Human Rights Commission after this took place, a Panamanian resolution meant to get Cuba off the hook for its human rights abuses was passed, against the efforts of the United States and its Ambassador, Armando Valladares, who spent 25 years in a Cuban prison.

It was very clear what was happening. A vote for Panama was a vote for Cuba. The countries who voted against us and against the Cuban people ought to pay for it, and that is the purpose of this amendment.

The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, very simply is to make those countries who voted against the human rights investigation of human right violations in Cuba pay for their lies to the United States. Many of them told us they were going to vote with us on the amendment and then reneged on it. So what this amendment does simply is it cuts the assistance to those countries by 50 percent during the fiscal year 1990 and 1991.

I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] has a perfecting amendment to this.

I have discussed this with the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and have told him that I would be happy to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] which would cut the 50-percent penalty, but would still send a message to these countries the countries of Botswana, Bulgaria, the People's Republic of China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, India, Iraq, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Sri Lanka, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the U.S.S.R. in Yugoslavia.

It would send a message to many of them that we are concerned about their vote in the United Nations and that next year unless they change and are willing to investigate the human rights violations of Cuba, a cutoff or a reduction in foreign aid may take place.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATRON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATRON to the amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: In the text proposed to be inserted by the amendment, strike out subsection (c).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern of the gentleman from Indiana about the U.N. Human Rights Commission vote on Cuba. Cuba is a repressive dictatorship and there was no substantive reason for the Commission to adopt the watered-down resolution sponsored by Panama.

Mr. Chairman, my subcommittee has had two human rights hearings on Cuba in the last few years and has worked on a bipartisan basis to focus international attention on the human rights abuses committed in Castro's Cuba.

The gentleman's amendment is well-intended, but would needlessly and adversely affect humanitarian programs in several impoverished nations. It would result in dramatic reductions in our programs to combat illicit narcotics trafficking in Columbia and Peru.

Further, it would cut the much needed assistance for displaced people in Cyprus. I would remind our colleagues that it was the Government of the Republic of Cyprus which allowed its territory to be used for overflights by the U.S. military to support our marines in Beirut when other countries in the region, including a NATO ally, would not. I think that kind of support for U.S. interests should be taken into account.

My amendment would retain the gentleman's policy statement and the country listing, but delete the provision mandating a 50-percent reduction in assistance. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. YATRON. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Yatron amendment which deletes a section in the Burton amendment mandating a reduction in assistance to Cyprus and other countries.

I share the disappointment of my colleagues about the U.S. Human Rights Commission vote on Cuba. It is regrettable that nations which share our values often fail to vote with us in international organizations. Punishing these countries, however, sets a bad precedent. I believe it would be unwise for America to cut aid to nations which might honestly disagree with our Government's position on a number of issues. Our assistance to other nations is given for humanitarian reasons or for foregn policy purposes, Linking U.S. aid to a country's voting record is counterproductive.

I strongly oppose cutting United States assistance to Cyprus during this sensitive period in the ongoing peace talks concerning the future of that island. Mr. Denktash and President Vassiliou of the Republic of Cyprus will soon meet at the United Nations and make important decisons regarding the next phase of the intercommunal talks. We should do everything possible to show our support for these negotiations and not undermine them by cutting badly needed U.S. assistance.

While I share Congressman BURTON's frustration with the voting records of many of our friends, I believe that cutting aid to these countries would ultimately undermine U.S. interests in those countries. We, not they, might suffer in the final analysis.

I urge your support of the Yatron amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 588, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 1404. UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION CALLING ZIONISM A FORM OF RACISM.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) when considering the furnishing of foreign assistance to any foreign country, the President should give serious consideration to whether that country has formally rejected the resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on November 10, 1975, that calls Zionism a form of racism; and

(2) the United States should continue to reject that resolution and should urge all other countries, which have not done so, to join in formally rejecting that resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, on November 10, 1975, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a resolution calling Zionism a form of racism. Mr. Chairman, this blatant act of anti-Semitism is the most disgusting action ever taken by the United Nations.

My amendment simply states that when considering foreign assistance to any foreign country, it is the sense of Congress that the President should give serious consideration to whether that country has formally rejected the U.N. resolution calling Zionism a form of racism. The amendment also states that the United States should continue to reject the resolution and should urge all other countries, which have not done so, to join in formally rejecting that resolution.

We should expect no less from any country, especially countries that receive U.S. foreign assistance. We must continue to send a signal to the world that the United States of America takes any act of anti-Semitism very seriously. We must never acknowledge, abide by or acquiesce in this infamous act by the so-called United Nations.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and I commend the gentleman for his fine work.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the President should consider in his foreign aid certification criteria whether a particular nation has formally rejected the resolution adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on November 10, 1975, which labels Zionism a form of racism.

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with that biased, absurd resolution. We are all acutely aware of that resolution's own brand of racism. This is an appropriate way for the U.S. Congress to clearly express itself to all of its allies, and to once again make salient the ill-conceived and poorly executed attempt by some United Nations member-states, to express anti-Israeli sentiment and anti-Jewish sentiment. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

□ 1610

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with that biased, absurd resolution, and we are acutely aware of that resolution's own brand of racism. I think this is an appropriate way for the Congress to clearly express our indignation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman and thank him.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BERMAN AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERMAN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: It is the sense of Congress that the United States should continue to reject the resolution adopted by the U.N. General Assembly on November 10, 1975, that calls Zionism a form of racism, and should urge all other countries which have not done so to join in formally rejecting that resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his substitute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute. I commend the gentleman from Indiana for bringing the issue of the resolution adopted by the United Nations back in 1975 to the attention of this body. We cannot remind ourselves too often of the horrendous nature and the sense of revulsion that I think most of us feel over the adoption of that resolution. That was surely one of the great black marks for the United Nations.

Many of those countries that supported that resolution which sought to deny the aspirations of Jewish people for a homeland were doing so under the coercion of oil and oil prices imposed by the chief proponents of that resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that my resolution and the substitute, is more appropriate for the purposes of supporting the Israeli Government and its safety and security, and I would also suggest to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that in furtherance of security for Israel, an aye vote on the foreign assistance bill is far more important than a hortatory resolution with respect to the question of that U.N. resolution, to suggest that a criterion for consideration of foreign assistance will be the renunciation of that resolution.

I join with the gentleman in hoping that countries muster up the courage to take the principled action and to renounce that resolution will defeat many of the efforts this Government and of the Israeli Government to develop diplomatic relationships with many of the countries to which the Arab oil embargo and a threat forced those countries to suspend diplomatic relations.

The resolution in its original form is not really in the best interests of Israeli security, the effort of the Israeli Government to broaden out and branch out and reestablish the relationships it had with so many countries in the Third World.

I believe that this resolution which accepts the gentleman's principles is a good substitute for it, and I would ask the gentleman to consider it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman makes a good point, and I accept his amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to offer my amendment calling on Israel to reopen schools in the West Bank. After talking to many people involved in this issue I have decided that the timing of the amendment is such that it may upset delicate negotiations in the region.

It is not my desire to upset any possible prospects for peace. Rather, the amendment was intended to be a propeace, proeducation amendment that did not assess blame.

I would like to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] in a colloquy regarding an agreement we have reached which would allow me to offer the amendment during consideration of the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I would like to make it clear that this agreement does not mean that I have backed down from my position. I am very much interested in the reestablishment of a normal educational environment in the West Bank. I will be watching the situation very closely between now and the time the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill is brought to the Floor. Should the situation in the West Bank

not change sufficiently by that time, my understanding of the agreement is that I will be reserved the opportunity to address the school closure issue at that later date.

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

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in the amendment and wanted to be supportive of it. If the gentleman is going to withhold it until the appropriation bill comes up, I will support it at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. NIELSON because I am concerned that Israel's restriction on education in the occupied territories is creating a generation of illiterate Palestinian children who have nothing to contribute to the Middle East peace process.

As a strong supporter of Israel, I sympathize with the concerns of Israeli military officials who worry that the assembly of Palestine children in schools may at times pose a threat to local security. But why is it also illegal to teach lessons in small private settings and in homes? Why must Palestinian children now go underground just to learn their ABC's? To date, I have not heard a single argument which would convince me that this policy is in the best interest of either Palestinian children or the State of Israel.

Certainly, there is little mystery about the consequences of inadequate education for the Palestinian society, or any society for that matter. Many of us are trying to cope with the growing dropout and illiteracy rate in our backyards, right here in the land of educational opportunity for all. I ask my colleagues to consider what kind of immediate and long-term crises you would be facing if all the students in your district stayed out of school for 2 years? The shortage of skilled manpower we are beginning to suffer from here in the United States will seem miniscule to the problems the Palestine economy of tomorrow is now certain to experience. No civilized society can afford to take such large steps backward in its development; The Palestinian case is no exception.

Most of the children who now throw stones at soldiers would be in school during the day if they could be. Palestinian mothers in the occupied territories don't send their children to school so they can plot to undermine Israeli authority. They want to see their kids get a solid education. Palestinians take immense pride in the fact that they are among the best educated people of the Arab world.

The undereducated, idle, and angry youngsters who now pick up rocks instead of pencils, will continue to fuel the Palestinian uprising until they are given a less violent option. I can't think of a better diversion than education.

By encouraging education in the territories, Israel can avoid confrontation by keeping children off the streets, and more importantly, it can help ensure a generation of Palestinians who are educated enough to recognize the mutual benefits of peaceful coexistence with Israel. It is time for Israel to reevaluate this policy, for the sake of Palestinian children and for the sake of furthering Middle East peace prospects.

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

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The author of the amendment, the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I have had a number of discussions including discussions with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. He has indicated to me that he has no objection to an amendment being proposed, and a discussion of this issue on the foreign operations bill when it reaches the House floor, provided that, and assuming that, the Republican leadership supports that kind of a discussion. He also made it clear that he is not committed to any particular language or proposal and would want the opportunity to review language of any amendment that he might be asked to support or vote on.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NIELSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and, first of all, say that I think that the fact that he will withdraw the amendment and save it for another time is in the best interests of peace in that area. I want to compliment him on that, and I also want to confirm what the gentleman from California has said and hope that there will be a discussion on this in the spirit in which we all want to see peace in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XIV?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any more amendments, but before the Chair left the chair, I wanted to express appreciation of the House for the excellent job he has done.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, for a moment I, too, want to join with the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], in paying tribute. The Chairman has handled this bill, I know, a number of times, and it has been a very difficult time. We on this side are very, very grateful for the way the gentleman conducted the entire process, and we thank him very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to H.R. 2655, the Foreign Aid Authorization Act. I know that my colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee worked hard on this legislation.

There are many positive portions of this measure including the aid to Israel and Egypt, Peace Corps funding, international narcotics control funding, and policies which promote human rights and democracy around the world.

But Mr. Chairman, this is not a bill just to aid Israel, nor is it a drug bill to fight the war on drugs. This is the foreign aid bill and it must be assessed in total with all of its good and bad points.

I have examined the bill and I cannot support it in its present form.

First of all, I am pleased that we were able to adopt the Fascell amendment to reduce the total funding in the bill. However, the legislation still increases funding over last year by nearly $400 million.

We have plenty of needs right here in the United States that are not being met due to the budget crunch. I came to Washington to reduce deficit spending, not increase it. I am not prepared to increase foreign aid, while simultaneously reducing domestic programs right here at home.

Second, the cargo preference provisions in the bill are very troubling. As a farmer, and a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I know the importance of keeping agricultural export costs to a minimum.

The provision which requires that 50 percent of the goods purchased by cash transfer recipient countries be carried on U.S. ships would be extremely detrimental to U.S. agriculture. They would erode the value of U.S. foreign aid and decrease exports, in particular agricultural exports.

The cargo preference provisions would make American exports more expensive because they would mandate that goods be exported in a costlier manner. According to the Agency for International Development [AID], the cost of shipping on U.S. vessels averages $58.79 per ton. The cost of shipping on foreign-flagged ships averages $33.17. I support a strong domestic shipping industry, but it makes no sense to increase the cost of exporting, especially at a time when our Nation is trying to deal with stubborn trade deficits and trying to improve our foreign trade position around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the authorization levels contained in the bill are scaled back, and I hope that the cargo preference provisions are stripped out in the Senate, or in the conference on the bill. At that time, I could support this important legislation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2655, the International Development and Cooperation Act of 1989. I want to commend the chairman of our full committee, Mr. FASCELL, for his leadership in keeping us on schedule and allowing us to get to the floor in an expeditious manner. Again this year, the chairman has succeeded in forging a bipartisan

consensus on many of the tough issues that the committee faces. The true measure of that success came in the overwhelming bipartisan vote in favor of the bill when it came out of committee.

Foreign aid has never been a popular program. All too often, it is viewed as a giveaway for which the United States received little or nothing in return. That's just not true. In terms of protecting our national security; in terms of advancing economic opportunity and opening foreign markets; and in terms of providing leadership in solving international problems; foreign aid funds allow the United States to play a superpower role.

That type of influence is available to the United States at an investment of about 1 percent of the the Federal budget. The bill reported by the committee comes in $4 million less than the Bush administration's request.

In years past, the foreign aid bill has also been a battlefield for partisan disputes over American foreign policy. This year, the key word was cooperation. The result was true bipartisan compromise on some of the thorniest issues facing the committee. Perhaps not everyone will be satisfied with every aspect of the bill, but the committee has fashioned a bill that finds common ground on nearly all the major issues we face.

In the Middle East, the bill maintains the current AID package for Israel and Egypt in support of the Camp David accords. This commitment ensures that the United States remains engaged in assisting the parties in the region to pursue the road to a lasting peace in the Middle East. In Europe and the Far East, the bill provides needed aid to strategic base rights countries. And in Latin America and Africa, AID promotes economic development and expanded market opportunities for our export community. And in Asia, the bill sends a strong signal to the Chinese Govenment that the American people remain outraged by the brutal murder of more than 700 peaceful demonstrators in Tiananmen Square—by codifying President Bush's sanctions against China into law.

Foreign aid isn't a giveaway. It's our insurance policy. It's a small investment that allows us to maintain our commitments to our allies, to open markets abroad and to help others to help themselves. I urge my colleagues to make that investment and vote for H.R. 2655.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Committee on Foreign Affairs for its support for those foreign aid programs which the committee believes will encourage broad-based, sustainable, participatory development, with particular emphasis on the poor. I am pleased by the committee's backing of child survival activities, efforts to alleviate poverty and improving the management of resources to promote environmentally and economically sustainable development. Our assistance for these overseas efforts represents our Nation's traditional values and the generosity of the American people, and I urge my colleagues to support those provisions of the International Cooperation Act which address the need to improve the human condition in poor, less developed countries.

I, however, have to differ with the overall thrust of the International Cooperation Act which places its greatest emphasis on security aid. Approximately 64 percent of the $11.5 billion authorized for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 simply feeds the military in many foreign lands. This is not my idea of the values that our foreign aid program should reflect.

Mr. Chairman, in particular, I want to express my disappointment with the Committee's decision to continue military aid for El Salvador. For 9 years, there has been an ongoing civil war in El Salvador. Nearly 70,000 people, mostly civilians, have been killed and the human misery there continues. United States policy toward El Salvador is sterile and bankrupt, and giving the Salvadoran military $85 million for each of the fiscal years 1990 and 1991 promises more of the same. Nine years of a savage war have not brought peace to the Salvadoran people. If the conflict is to be ended, then all military aid must cease and the Salvadoran Government must be encouraged to participate in a negotiated political settlement. H.R. 2655 fails to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 2655 and I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the outstanding work of Chairman FASCELL and the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for their months of tireless work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Since 1981, Congress has passed only two free-standing foreign aid bills. Our progress on this bill is a further sign that the House is back on track, addressing our Nation's most pressing problems.

We often speak of America's commitment to freedom and self-determination around the world. Foreign aid is one place where we put our money where our mouth is. It fulfills a basic humanitarian spirit in the American people to help those less fortunate than ourselves. It says that where there is poverty, disease, and hunger, America will be there to help ease the suffering.

I'm particularly pleased with our new commitment to the Multilateral Assistance Initiative in the Philippines—our renewed support for famine relief in Africa—and our expanded funding for Peace Corps, with the goal of reaching the level of 10,000 volunteers by the year 1992.

This bill also puts America squarely on the side of those promoting economic and political freedom around the world, applying a single standard to all countries, from China to El Salvador, from Kenya to Burma, from Nicaragua to Mozambique.

In this age of budget stringency and pressing problems here at home, some may ask if we can afford $11.5 billion for foreign aid. I believe we can't afford not to fund this program. This bill promotes goals that are vital to our political, economic, security, and environmental interests. By promoting prosperity in developing countries, we help create a secure and stable world, to the benefit of all nations. By supporting the forces of free enterprise, we expand our opportunities for our own exports and investment. By fostering sound environmental practices, we protect the world's fragile ecological balance.

Nowhere do our foreign and domestic interests merge more strongly than in the provisions relating to drugs.

The scourge of drugs begins abroad, and works its insidious way into America's inner cities and suburbs. To complement our other efforts at interdiction and enforcement here, this bill goes to the source of these drugs in foreign countries. We give the President every penny he asked for to assist antidrug efforts abroad—$155 million.

Then we go several major steps further, providing new weapons in the war on drugs. We renew overseas programs in last year's drug bill that the administration would have allowed to expire.

We start innovative new programs, including those which offer countries new assistance if they get tough on drugs.

We create a $14 million fund to finance development projects in countries that undertake programs to eliminate production of illegal drugs, especially cocaine.

We tell foreign officials that allow their countries to be used for money laundering, bribery, or trafficking: "You won't receive another penny of American aid until your clean up your act."

The Administration asked us to delay these measures until next September, when they unveil a new plan. Today, with this bill, we are saying that drugs don't take the summer off, and neither should we. We must attack this epidemic now.

On drugs—on human rights—on famine relief—and on promoting basic human needs, this bill uses the power of the purse to guide our foreign policy in the right direction.

It is an outstanding bill. It deserves our strongest support.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2655, the Foreign Assistance Act authorization for fiscal 1990 and 1991.

This agreement was worked out as a result of the 1990 budget negotiations with the White House and the leaedership of the House and the Senate. While I was not a part of the negotiating process, I did vote in favor of the 1990 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) when it came to the floor. As a result, I feel that I am now obligated to abide by the decisions of the negotiators, as ratified by both the House and Senate.

My decision to support passage of this bill can not, and should not, be construed by anyone as unqualified support for this package, or the concept of foreign aid. H.R. 2655 will authorize the expenditure of at least $23 billion in tax dollars over the next 2 years. This is not a responsibility that I take lightly.

The United States, as the leader of the free world, has an obligation to help her allies, and those countries that are striving for the freedoms that we currently enjoy. H.R. 2655 pro-

vides needed assistance to developing countries, as well as to good friends and allies such as Israel and Egypt.

The fiscal, economic and political realities of the day must force us to take another look at what we hope to achieve through foreign assistance packages. I have found over time that very few individuals, or countries, are successful at buying one's loyalty. In fact, it sometimes appears that the more money we send abroad, the more enemies we make. That's not the type of foreign policy that we want in this country.

As the elected representatives of the people of Wyoming to the House, I have an obligation to look out for their best interests. Wyoming has lost hundreds of jobs since the beginning of this decade, and unfair foreign competition has played a key role in these losses.

With limited tax dollars available, we have to become more responsible in how the Congress spends it. H.R. 2655 is, for the most part, a "done" deal as a result of the budget summit. In the future, I will look more closely at these bills to ensure that they are not only in the best interests of foreign governments and a small group of negotiators, but in the best interests of the people of Wyoming as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. AuCoin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2655) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 179, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

□ 1620

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. LEACH OF IOWA

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEACH of Iowa moves that the bill H.R. 2655 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 62, strike out the sentence beginning in line 12; and page 64, strike out lines 6 through 10.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] will be recognized for 5 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and I are offering this motion to recommit.

What it does, quite simply, is strike the cargo preferences part of this bill. Frankly, we are not misled into thinking necessarily that we can get a majority vote. But we feel quite strongly that cargo preference is an issue that should be revisited and put in a larger context.

When this gentleman came to this body in the mid-1970's, he had the feeling that this Congress was an energetic, reform-oriented institution. The question today is whether this body is becoming increasingly a body susceptible to approve particularist interests against the national interest.

The goal of this bill in a very large context is simply to assist less privileged countries; and secondly, to enhance the exports of the United States of America. Cargo preference has the effect of increasing middleman fees, thus decreasing aid to the poorest of the poor, and decreasing American exports. It runs full square counter to the purposes of this bill.

There are growing frustrations in this body about the trade deficit with Japan. The "made in Japan" label has become a major American challenge.

But to thousands of midwestern farmers, to workers who man midwestern ports, to the poorest of the poor in Africa, to hunger and relief organizations around the world, to outside observers like the Grace Commission, cargo preference is a scandal "made in Congress."

What the minority party would like to do is ask this body to be serious about helping balance our trade as well as our budget.

We also would like this body to be honest about sticking with an agreement once made, in this case the one made between all the parties in the last Congress about cargo preference.

Most importantly, we believe it is time to stand up for the little guy over a few big shipping companies and a few powerful unions. It is time to return to our reform tradition. It is time to strike the cargo preference provisions in this particular statute.

I urge the majority party in particular to give this serious consideration.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] that it is necessary for the gentleman to use his 5 minutes. A reservation is not permitted under the rules.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I want you hawks on this side of the aisle to listen to me. I am one of you. I want you to vote for a strong national defense.

Thirty years ago this country had 4,000 American bottom merchant marine ships, and we had huge surpluses in trade. Today we have 400 ships and we have huge trade deficits.

Why? I will tell my colleagues why. Look at the backward nations like China, which we have just finished talking about all day today. Twenty years ago China had 60, just 60 merchant marine ships. Today they have 1,200, three times as many as we have in America.

Do my colleagues want to know what happened to those 3,600 American ships? They were economically torpedoed to lay on the bottom of the ocean.

If we are going to turn around the trade in this country, we are not going to let these other industrialized nations subsidize their industries. We are going to go into the business ourselves. This is the way to do it.

China exports 70 percent of their goods on their bottoms to this country, putting our people out of work. Today is the day to keep cargo in here, and send the message to Japan and the rest of these countries that we are not going to take it anymore, we are not turning the other cheek.

Vote against this motion to recommit.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment seems familiar, if this debate seems familiar, it is because it is. Twice in this session, once in the last Congress Members have been called upon to vote for this same amendment. Now we ask Members to do so again as they did only 2 days ago by a wide margin, because the issue is simple: Do not ask the American people to send their foreign aid abroad so that it will be used for Argentine wheat or Cuban sugar or Japanese machine tools.

Our amendment is simple. If foreign aid is not spent in the recipient country, spend it in America.

Finally, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has said this well, we cannot be a strong nation, we cannot be a secure nation, we cannot have real national security without a merchant marine. Ours is in collapse.

I know that the ideal place to assure a strong national security and a merchant marine is not in the foreign aid bill, I agree. But the reality is this is our only choice.

What I ask is this: If American aid is to go to other nations, allow a portion of it to go on American ships so that the American flag stays on the high seas, available for national emergencies, available for national security available if America needs it.

Members have voted on that amendment three times in the last two Congresses. Please do so again.

Defeat the motion to recommit. Stand with the committee, stand with the bipartisan majority of this House. Defeat the motion to recommit, keep cargo preference, keep American aid flowing back into America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, since I was not in the Chamber when the debate began, to be given 2 minutes of the time that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] did not use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being given this opportunity to speak on an issue that is very important to me and to the people living in my district and State.

The Torricelli amendment will be counterproductive for exports. It will be counterproductive for bulk exports of all kinds. It will be counterproductive for manufactured goods.

I want to make it quite clear to the Members of this body what they are voting on. If they vote to leave the Torricelli language in the legislation, they are voting for reduced exports from the United States. Cargo preference takes food directly out of the mouths of starving children, and in this instance we are expanding it beyond that point, however. We are expanding it beyond the Food for Peace Program. We are expanding it to an impact so that it affects every nation except those for which there is an exception in the legislation that receives cash transfers or ESF funds.

What does that even mean? It means that those countries have to buy as much in U.S. exports as they receive in ESF funds. That sounds fair, does it not?

But in reality, on the average, they are already importing from the United States 13 times as much as the ESF funds they receive. Those countries oftentimes, in fact generally, almost always import their grain, import the coal not through commercial channels, they do it through government agencies.

So a vote for the Leach motion to recommit will strike the Torricelli language. A vote for the Leach language is a vote for coal miners, despite what the union people might say. A vote for the Leach amendment is a vote for agriculture exports.

□ 1630

Make no mistake about it, that is the way it comes down. A vote against him means that the outside influences that are using their political action committees' money here are going to win. That is unfortunate for the American people.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], which will be a 15-minute vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule XI, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 162, noes 255, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

AYES—162

Archer	Dorgan (ND)	Hopkins
Armey	Dornan (CA)	Houghton
Atkins	Douglas	Huckaby
Baker	Dreier	Hyde
Ballenger	Durbin	Ireland
Bartlett	Edwards (OK)	Jacobs
Barton	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Bereuter	English	Jontz
Berman	Fawell	Kaptur
Bliley	Frenzel	Kasich
Boucher	Frost	Kastenmeier
Broomfield	Gallegly	Kleczka
Brown (CO)	Gekas	Kolbe
Bruce	Gillmor	Kyl
Buechner	Gingrich	LaFalce
Burton	Glickman	Lagomarsino
Campbell (CA)	Gradison	Leach (IA)
Carr	Grandy	Leath (TX)
Coble	Grant	Lewis (FL)
Coleman (MO)	Gunderson	Lightfoot
Combest	Hall (OH)	Long
Cooper	Hall (TX)	Lukens, Donald
Costello	Hamilton	Madigan
Cox	Hammerschmidt	Martin (IL)
Craig	Hancock	Mazzoli
Crane	Hansen	McCandless
Dannemeyer	Hastert	McCloskey
DeLay	Hatcher	McCurdy
DeWine	Henry	McEwen
Dickinson	Hiler	McHugh
McMillan (NC)	Rhodes	Stangeland
Meyers	Ritter	Stearns
Michel	Roberts	Stenholm
Montgomery	Robinson	Stump
Moody	Rogers	Synar
Moorhead	Rohrabacher	Tauke
Morrison (WA)	Roth	Thomas (CA)
Myers	Sabo	Thomas (WY)
Nielson	Schuette	Upton
Oberstar	Schulze	Valentine
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Vento
Oxley	Sharp	Visclosky
Panetta	Shuster	Volkmer
Parker	Sikorski	Vucanovich
Pashayan	Skeen	Walker
Paxon	Skelton	Walsh
Pease	Slattery	Watkins
Penny	Slaughter (VA)	Weber
Petri	Smith (NE)	Whittaker
Pickle	Smith (TX)	Whitten
Porter	Smith, Denny (OR)	Wolf
Poshard	Smith, Robert (OR)	Wolpe
Pursell	Stallings	Wylie
Ray		Young (FL)
Regula		

NOES—255

Ackerman	Fascell	Lowery (CA)
Akaka	Fazio	Lowey (NY)
Alexander	Feighan	Luken, Thomas
Anderson	Fields	Machtley
Andrews	Fish	Manton
Annunzio	Flake	Markey
Anthony	Flippo	Martin (NY)
Applegate	Foglietta	Martinez
Aspin	Ford (MI)	Matsui
AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Mavroules
Barnard	Frank	McCollum
Bateman	Gallo	McCrery
Bates	Gaydos	McDade
Beilenson	Gejdenson	McGrath
Bennett	Gephardt	McMillen (MD)
Bevill	Gibbons	McNulty
Bilbray	Gilman	Mfume
Bilirakis	Gonzalez	Miller (CA)
Boehlert	Goodling	Miller (OH)
Boggs	Gordon	Miller (WA)
Bonior	Goss	Mineta
Borski	Gray	Moakley
Bosco	Green	Molinari
Boxer	Guarini	Mollohan
Brennan	Harris	Morella
Brooks	Hawkins	Morrison (CT)
Browder	Hayes (IL)	Mrazek
Brown (CA)	Hayes (LA)	Murphy
Bunning	Hefley	Murtha
Bustamante	Hefner	Nagle
Byron	Herger	Natcher
Callahan	Hertel	Neal (MA)
Campbell (CO)	Hoagland	Neal (NC)
Cardin	Hochbrueckner	Nelson
Carper	Holloway	Nowak
Chandler	Horton	Oakar
Clarke	Hoyer	Olin
Clay	Hubbard	Ortiz
Clement	Hughes	Owens (NY)
Clinger	Hunter	Owens (UT)
Coleman (TX)	Hutto	Packard
Conte	Inhofe	Pallone
Conyers	James	Parris
Coughlin	Jenkins	Patterson
Coyne	Johnson (CT)	Payne (NJ)
Crockett	Johnston	Payne (VA)
Darden	Jones (GA)	Pelosi
Davis	Jones (NC)	Perkins
de la Garza	Kanjorski	Pickett
DeFazio	Kennedy	Price
Dellums	Kennelly	Quillen
Derrick	Kildee	Rahall
Dicks	Kolter	Rangel
Dingell	Kostmayer	Ravenel
Dixon	Lancaster	Richardson
Donnelly	Lantos	Ridge
Downey	Laughlin	Rinaldo
Duncan	Lehman (CA)	Roe
Dwyer	Lehman (FL)	Rose
Dymally	Leland	Rostenkowski
Dyson	Lent	Roukema
Early	Levin (MI)	Rowland (CT)
Eckart	Levine (CA)	Rowland (GA)
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Russo
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Saiki
Erdreich	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Espy	Livingston	Savage
Evans	Lloyd	Sawyer

Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Shaw
Shays
Shumway
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (MS)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (VT)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Unsoeld
Vander Jagt
Walgren
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Wise
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

Bentley
Bryant
Chapman
Collins
Courter
Florio
Garcia
Marlenee
McDermott
Roybal
Sarpalius
Smith (IA)
Williams
Wilson
Wright

□1650

Ms. SCHNEIDER and Messrs. FLAKE, VANDER JAGT, HUBBARD, and HUNTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PURSELL, PANETTA, PASHAYAN, OBERSTAR, and VENTO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the Members that this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas, 314, nays, 101, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—314

Ackerman
Akaka
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Armey
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Bonior
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Broomfield
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Bruce
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Douglas
Downey
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Grant
Gray
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hertel
Hiler
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Lukens, Donald
Machtley
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Rangel
Ravenel
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Roe
Rohrabacher
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Saiki
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (MS)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (VT)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stokes
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Unsoeld
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walsh
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

NAYS—101

Alexander
Applegate
Archer
Barnard
Barton
Bennett
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Brooks
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conyers
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Dickinson
Duncan
Early
Edwards (OK)
English
Fawell
Fields
Gaydos
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Holloway
Hopkins
Hubbard
Huckaby
Jacobs
Jones (NC)
Kastenmeier
Kolter
Leach (IA)
Lewis (FL)
Lloyd
Long
Martin (IL)
Mazzoli
McCandless
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nielson
Oberstar
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Russo
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stark
Stearns
Studds
Stump
Tanner
Tauzin
Traficant
Valentine
Walker
Watkins
Whittaker
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson
Bentley
Bryant
Chapman
Collins
Courter
Florio
Garcia
Luken, Thomas
Marlenee
McDermott
Roybal
Smith (IA)
Torres
Williams
Wilson
Wright

□ 1659

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Roybal against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1700

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. 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 passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2655, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ACT OF 1989

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill just passed, H.R. 2655, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, cross references, punctuation, and grammatical and spelling errors, to correct the table of contents to reflect the provisions of the bill as passed, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 315

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be permitted to file a report on H.R. 315 during the forthcoming recess.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1989, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1391, TV VIOLENCE ACT OF 1989

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m., Friday, July 7, 1989, to file a report on H.R. 1391, the TV Violence Act of 1989.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M. FRIDAY, JULY 7, 1989, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2022, RELATING TO REFUGEE STATUS OF SOVIET AND INDO-CHINESE REFUGEES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m., Friday, July 7, 1989, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 2022, relating to refugee status of certain Soviet and Indo-Chinese refugees.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A BILL MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1990

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes.

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

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

There was no objection.

ALAN WOODS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that this morning the Honorable Alan Woods, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, died following a lengthy illness. His tenure as Administrator was marked by creativity, energy, and dedication to higher standards of public service.

Mr. Speaker, the United States will miss him as a dedicated public servant, and we on the Committee on Foreign Affairs will miss him also. We had the privilege of working with this man. He was a dedicated man, he was open-minded, he worked hard, and even in his last days when he was in extreme pain he spent hours with us working on this piece of legislation which this Congress has just passed, and in a way it is kind of a monument to his dedication to try to improve our national programs for developmental and security assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sympathies to Mrs. Woods and their two young children on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ALAN WOODS

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the chairman in tribute to a valiant American—Alan Woods, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development—who died this morning after an extended and courageous battle against cancer. In many respects the foreign aid bill just passed is a product of Alan's dedication to development in Third World countries and advancing American values and interests throughout the poverty stricken region of the globe.

I send my deepest sympathy to his family—especially his wife and two children—this country will miss Alan's contributions. He had served his country at the Department of Defense, as Special Assistant to the U.S. Trade Representative and at the Agency for International Development. Alan Woods exemplified the best of what public service stands for.

ALAN WOODS

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I join with the other expressions of concern and regret at the death of Alan Woods.

Alan Woods in the finest sense of the word is a conservative. He believed in limited government. He believed in giving the private sector an opportunity to do a lot of the world's work. But he also tempered that belief with a strong compassion for human beings individually and collectively. He, I think, engendered a great deal of respect and affection on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Woods showed a very rare ability to reach out and work with a great deal of respect with congressional staff. He cared very deeply about his wife and his children. I know that he talked to me about them at a State Department dinner just a few months ago. He talked at great length about his family. I know that they are suffering extreme pain right now.

Mr. Speaker, I want them to know that all of us who knew him share that pain and that grief, and I am also sure that those who today are working at AID feel a great sense of loss, and I want them to know that we share that sense of loss today.

DEATH OF ALAN WOODS, AID ADMINISTRATOR

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened this afternoon to learn of the death earlier today of Alan Woods, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development. Alan died after a prolonged and courageous battle with cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Woods was truly a dedicated public servant. While his tenure with AID was relatively short, about a year and a half, during that time he was anything but a caretaker administrator. He cared about the agency and about its role in a changed world economic and social circumstance. He cared enough about the agency to institute an in-depth study of the effectiveness of its programs entitled "Development and the National Interest."

In many respects the bill we just passed today, the Foreign Assistance Authorization Act, represents some of the fruits of that study, which is generally referred to as the "Woods Report." While the bill does not go as far in the direction of aiming our foreign assistance programs at basic economic development bottlenecks as Alan would have liked, it is a start.

Prior to his service at AID, Alan served in various public service positions, including Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Civilian Chief of Staff to the Secretary of Defense, Deputy Director for Presidential Personnel at the White House, Chief of Staff for the Governor of Missouri and Press Assistant for President Nixon. Alan also had a distinguished career in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost an experienced and promising public servant. We send our sympathy and best wishes to his wife, Cameron, and his two young daughters.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for when we return.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 10, the House will meet at noon, but it will be a pro forma session, and there will be no votes.

On Tuesday, July 11, the House will meet at noon, and there will be six bills on suspension:

H.R. 1312, Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1989;

H.R. 2087, to transfer a certain program with respect to child abuse from title IV of Public Law 98-473 to the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act;

H.R. 2088, to extend certain programs established in the Temporary Child Care for Handicapped Children and Crisis Nurseries Act of 1986;

H.R. 2653, export administration authorization;

H.R. 491, to establish a mining experimental program on critical minerals; and

H.R. 1705, Mining and Minerals Policy Act Amendments of 1989.

As normal, we will hold all votes until after the debate on all suspensions.

On Wednesday, July 12, the House will meet at 10 and take up the Department of the Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1990, subject to a rule, and that will continue on Thursday until completed, and then on Thursday, July 13, and Friday, if necessary, we will have H.R. 987, the Tongass Timber Reform Act, and H.R. 2022 to provide relief for certain Soviet and Indo-Chinese Refugees.

□ 1710

We will be meeting at 10 a.m. on Thursday and Friday, if necessary.

I would say to the minority leader that it is our hope and intention that we can complete this schedule by Thursday evening and therefore avoid a Friday session; however, if we have not finished the work by Thursday evening, we intend to be in on Friday.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

In a conversation I had earlier in the day with the Speaker making reference to our earlier conversation with respect to the program, the Speaker wanted to underscore, as I would surely and I am sure joined by the majority leader, that if we are successful in moving the program that week to be able to be off on Friday that in no case should Members think that should be the pattern for the balance of July, because quite frankly, it cannot be if we are going to complete our workload in time to get out for our August recess. Members are quite well aware of the number of appropriation bills that are languishing in the wind that will have to be taken care of.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether the leader would inquire whether the following Monday, that would be the second Monday after we return, we would have votes.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, the gentleman heard the question, and while I suspect there has not been a definite program scheduled or on the books as yet, under our overall agreement we were attempting, I think, to indicate to the Members that after what—3 o'clock, or did we change it to 4 or 4:30 on Mondays, in deference to those folks from the West Coast who have problems getting back with their planes the same day, that Members have got to really expect rollcall votes after the hour of 3 surely, and if possible maybe after 4.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is correct. Our intention is to have votes each Monday during the month of July after the Monday of the week after next, but we would hold votes until 4:30 so that Members from the farther western regions of the country would have a chance to get here.

We would also have votes each Friday up until about 3 o'clock.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am hearing a rumor that there is going to be an attempt to make certain we finish all appropriation bills before we go home on the August recess.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that is not just a rumor, that is a hoped for reality.

Mr. WALKER. Well, the thing I am concerned about is that we have one appropriation bill when we come back that week. I am told that we may have one appropriation bill the next week. The next week is reserved for the Defense Authorization bill. That would leave us 10 appropriation bills to do in four days at the beginning of August. That does not seem to me to be a schedule that is likely to be kept.

The question this gentleman has is: does that mean we go further into August in order to complete the schedule?

Mr. GEPHARDT. It is my belief that we will have more than one appropriation bill in the second week when we come back, and again I would urge the gentleman to remember that we will be meeting on Mondays and Fridays and there will probably be some late night votes as we go through these weeks. We believe that we can get all that business completed.

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

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 1989

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, July 12, 1989.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, AND TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, July 10, 1989, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CHECKUP WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 95) to designate the week of September 10, 1989, through September 16, 1989, as "National Checkup Week", and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. STALLINGS], the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 227.

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, more than 34 million Americans are hospitalized each year. Another 34 million adults suffer from obesity; nearly 66 million are victims of heart disease; more than 60 million suffer from high blood pressure; and an estimated 25 percent of adult Americans are afflicted with levels of elevated blood cholesterol.

Too many Americans don't take their health seriously until it's too late. Regular medical checkups can help reduce the chances of serious illness and can help curb skyrocketing health care costs.

For these reasons, I introduced House Joint Resolution 227, a resolution designating the week of September 10-16 as "National Checkup Week."

Establishing "National Checkup Week" will enhance public awareness and encourage regular medical screening that may reveal serious medical conditions, such as high blood pressure, high cholesterol levels, breast cancer, to name just a few. Such screening ultimately can reduce the chances of a serious illness or premature death.

I would like to thank the many colleagues who joined me in cosponsoring this legislation, and I would especially like to thank Mr. SAWYER and Mr. RIDGE, chairman and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, respectively, for their assistance in passing this resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 95

Whereas more than 34,000,000 Americans are hospitalized each year;

Whereas nearly 66,000,000 Americans are afflicted with some form of heart of blood vessel disease;

Whereas approximately 34,000,000 Americans between the ages 24 and 74 suffer from obesity;

Whereas more than 60,000,000 Americans suffer from high blood pressure;

Whereas an estimated 25 percent of adult Americans have elevated blood cholesterol levels;

Whereas annual medical check-ups can decrease the number of hospitalizations, reduce the likelihood of a serious illness or premature death, and curb escalating health care costs; and

Whereas annual medical screening may reveal previously undetected high blood pressure, high blood cholesterol, cancer, and obesity-related ailments: Now, therefore be it.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of September 10 through September 16, 1989, is designated as "National Check-Up Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

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

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 149) designating February 16, 1990, as "Lithuanian Independence Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO], the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, in its hundreds of years of existence, Lithuania has only enjoyed a short 22 years as an independent nation. After centuries of foreign domination, the people of Lithuania joined together and on February 16, 1918, proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

After developing a governmental system similar to that of the United States, in August of 1922 the young nation adopted a permanent Constitution which accorded its citizens freedom of speech, religion, and communication. Recognized as a sovereign nation, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations and exchanged diplomatic representatives with other sovereign nations. With legislative power vested in a Parliament, and the executive authority in a President and Cabinet of Ministers, the Government made a number of drastic reforms.

Great emphasis was placed on improving agricultural production; the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. The institution of a land reform program dispersed the land more evenly among the citizens and resulted in Lithuania becoming a nation of small farmers. In addition, industrialization progressed remarkably. In 1913 there were only 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees. By 1939, there were over 16,000 enterprises employing over 33,000 workers.

A respected member of the international community, Lithuania made great strides in social legislation; doubling the number of grammar schools in only 9 years, enacting a labor control law, and introducing the 8-hour day. In addition, Lithuania experienced a cultural renaissance in music and literature which was inspired by its great national folklore.

But Lithuania's flourishing independence was short-lived. During World War II, Lithuania embraced a policy of absolute neutrality. A policy which was ignored, first by Germany and then by the Soviet Union. The Soviets demanded immediate formation of a friendly government through a Communist-controlled election. On August 3, 1940, this new government requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and at this request, Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Under the current Soviet puppet government, the people of Lithuania have suffered many hardships. A nation known for its social reforms and cultural renaissance was silenced. It is believed that between 1945 and 1951, 350,000 Lithuanians were arrested and deported to Siberia. Since their incorporation into the Soviet Union, the borders of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, have been kept sealed, leaving these people to fight their battles against Soviet control in complete isolation.

The United States has recognized the independent Lithuanian Government since 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. We continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent Government. The United States has continually condemned the aggression and tyranny to which the Baltic States have fallen victim. We must assure the brave people of Lithuania that we have not forgotten.

In an August 1958 meeting, the Lithuanian World Congress adopted a unanimous resolution urging that "Lithuanians continue fiercely resisting the alien rule" of the Soviet Union and asserting that Lithuanians "have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." Today, the fight still exists. Freedom fighters and nationalists are demanding economic and political self-determination from their Soviet masters. In the past, Congress has strongly supported the Lithuanian people's valiant struggle for independence. The official recognition of "Lithuanian Indpendence Day" is important to Americans as a tangible manifestation of our support for the Lithuanian people's aspirations for freedom.

□ 1720

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 149

Whereas February 16, 1990, is the 72nd anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania;

Whereas on February 16, 1918, the Council of Lithuania, the sole representative of the Lithuanian people, in conformity with the recognized right to national self determination, proclaimed the restoration of an independent and democratic Lithuania and ended all ties that formally subordinated Lithuania to other nations;

Whereas Lithuania was independent until 1940 when the Soviet Union took over the country;

Whereas the United States opposes tyranny and injustice in all forms and supports the cause of Lithuanian independence; and

Whereas the oppressed people currently living in Lithuania keep the flame of freedom forever burning in their hearts: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 16, 1990, is designated as "Lithuanian Independence Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

NATIONAL LITERACY DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 96) designating July 2, 1989, as "National Literacy Day," 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 Ohio?

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, my friend BILL FORD of Michigan, for his assistance in bringing this resolution to the floor today. I also want to express my appreciation to Congressman THOMAS SAWYER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, and to my colleagues who have cosponsored this legislation.

House Joint Resolution 277 will designate this coming Sunday, July 2, as "National Literacy Day." Passage of this resolution will demonstrate congressional support for nationwide efforts to improve the plight of 27 million Americans who lack the basic skills to function in our society.

The date of July 2 is historically significant, because it was on that day 25 years ago that President Lyndon Baines Johnson signed the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964. Our Nation has made great strides forward since that historic day, but too many of our citizens are still unable to fulfill their potential because of the scourge of illiteracy.

By showing our concern here in Congress, we will be helping local schools, libraries, and community organizations to promote literacy programs.

We know that illiteracy takes a terrible and painful toll, both in terms of its impact on individual lives and on our American society as a whole. The daily feelings of frustration and defeat that afflict those who cannot read signs, instructions, warning labels, or newspapers too often lead to escape through alcohol or drug abuse. At a time in our history when we are struggling to remain competitive in world markets, we cannot afford the loss of productivity that accompanies illiteracy. It has been estimated that the total cost of errors, accidents and missed opportunities in business has reached a staggering $225 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have in our communities many dedicated volunteers and professionals who are working to remedy the problem of illiteracy. This is a chance to give them the recognition and encouragement they deserve.

Congress has approved this worthy resolution for the past 3 years. As we approach the Fourth of July, Independence Day, let us also offer the hope of independence to the millions of our fellow citizens who are trapped in the prison of illiteracy. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for House Joint Resolution 277, to designate July 2 as "National Literacy Day."

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Subcommittee on Census and Population for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have some prepared remarks on National Literacy Day because of the strong support I have for the effort that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] has made in acquiring the sponsorship in the very short order necessary to bring House Joint Resolution 277 and its companion measure, Senate Joint Resolution 96, to the floor as "National Literacy Day."

I suspect that in the course of the last 3 years as this measure has been brought to the floor, however, we have seen an appreciation of literacy evolve and change from what once was as little as a couple of decades ago may have been viewed as a strict, stiff, academic issue into what today is generally regarded as a survival tool in a society in transition.

Just as this society is in transition, so is the definition of literacy. The truth of the matter is that when Lyndon Johnson signed that act just a couple of decades ago, the truth was that a man could have a good attitude and the capacity to use a set of tools and go off to work and expect to earn his family a decent living. Today, however, a man or a woman who does not have not only the capacity to read and write and calculate but a full range of higher order thinking skills, problem solving skills, a man or a woman who does not have that capacity does not have the skills necessary to be fully competitive in a terribly competitive world today.

Mr. Speaker, in short, what we mean by literacy today has become a moving target, a rapidly moving target, and one that demands the attention of everyone in this Congress and, in truth, everyone in this Nation.

I rise, as much as anything today, to say "thank you" to Senator LAUTENBERG and, especially, to say "thank you" to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for his efforts to bring this measure before us today.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 96

Whereas literacy is a necessary tool for survival in our society;

Whereas thirty-five million Americans today read at a level which is less than necessary for full survival needs;

Whereas there are twenty-seven million adults in the United States who cannot read, whose resources are left untapped, and who are unable to offer their full contribution to society;

Whereas illiteracy is growing rapidly, as two million three-hundred thousand persons, including one million two-hundred thousand legal and illegal immigrants, one million high school dropouts, and one hundred thousand refugees, are added to the pool of illiterates annually;

Whereas the annual cost of illiteracy to the United States in terms of welfare expenditures, crime, prison expenses, lost revenues, and industrial and military accidents has been estimated at $225,000,000,000;

Whereas the competitiveness of the United States is eroded by the presence in the workplace of millions of Americans who are functionally or technologically illiterate;

Whereas there is a direct correlation between the number of illiterate adults unable to perform at the standard necessary for available employment and the money allo-

cated to child welfare and unemployment compensation;

Whereas the percentage of illiterates in proportion to population size is higher for blacks and Hispanics, resulting in increased economic and social discrimination against these minorities;

Whereas the prison population represents the single highest concentration of adult illiteracy;

Whereas one million children in the United States between the ages of twelve and seventeen cannot read above a third grade level, 13 per centum of all seventeen-year-olds are functionally illiterate, and 15 per centum of graduates of urban high schools read at less than a six grade level;

Whereas 85 per centum of the juveniles who appear in criminal court are functionally illiterate;

Whereas the 47 per centum illiteracy rate among black youths is expected to increase 50 per centum by 1990;

Whereas one-half of all heads of households cannot read past the eighth grade level and one-third of all mothers on welfare are functionally illiterate.

Whereas the cycle of illiteracy continues because the children of illiterate parents are often illiterate themselves because of the lack of support they receive from their home environment;

Whereas Federal, State, municipal, and private literacy programs have only been able to reach 5 per centum of the total illiterate population;

Whereas it is vital to call attention to the problem of illiteracy, to understand the severity of the problem and its detrimental effects on our society, and to reach those who are illiterate and unaware of the free services and help available to them; and

Whereas it is also necessary to recognize and thank the thousands of volunteers who are working to promote literacy and provide support to the millions of illiterates in need of assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 2, 1989, is designated as "National Literacy Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

DECADE OF THE BRAIN

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 174) to designate the decade beginning January 1, 1990, as the "Decade of the Brain," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], the chief sponsor, who has spent considerable time on the floor both Tuesday and Wednesday and now finally Thursday in anticipation of this resolution.

□ 1730

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank my dear and beloved friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is absolutely right, and I have canceled all of my plans for tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words as the House declares the 1990's the "Decade of the Brain." Virtually the entire medical community supports this resolution. It has 246 cosponsors, and I hope it will enjoy unanimous support when we act on it today.

It will help focus attention on problems which cost our country dearly—in both hard cash and human suffering. Among these are mental illness; head injuries, epilepsy, drug abuse and addition, alcoholism, Alzheimer's disease, strokes, dystonia, brain-related problems requiring surgery, and many more. An NIMH study recently showed that more than 10 percent of American adults, at any one time, suffer from a mental disorder. The percentage of children is even higher.

Our scientists and our medical community are making tremendous strides in these and many related fields. Ninety percent of these advances have come in the last 10 years, and our progress during the Decade of the Brain will be even more spectacular.

Technological advances let us view the brain and even conduct surgery without a scalpel. Progress in genetics lets us identify the genes that cause certain schizophrenias. New discoveries on the effects of drugs on the brain contribute to treatment of addition and alcohol abuse.

Treatment is improving rapidly for people with head injury, dystonia, developmental disabilities, speech, hearing and other cognitive dysfunctions; inheritable disorders like Huntington's Disease; Parkinson's disease; and Alzheimer's.

The progress has been rewarded in the past 15 years by 15 Nobel Prizes in medicine or physiology. That underlines how exciting and how productive this time has been. The next 10 years, the Decade of the Brain, will be even better.

In the 1990's, with an aging population, with even more remarkable technological advances, with better insight into medicine and the physical processes of the brain, our attention will focus as never before on brain-related science and medicine. Designating the 1990's the Decade of the Brain will give well-deserved public attention to those scientists, doctors, nurses and technicians who serve us all so well, and I am happy to have had a hand in it.

Mr. Speaker, the field of research related to the brain is changing so fast that, today, I am able to point to real accomplishments in brain-related research in the short period of time since I first introduced my Decade of the Brain resolution 5 years ago. Let me share with my colleagues some of the results of our efforts to focus attention on the brain and brain-related research.

I am pleased to report that, at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke and the National Institute of Mental Health—the two most involved agencies in the battle against brain-related disorders and diseases—several major accomplishments already have been achieved.

Most importantly, the two agencies were able to compile the first coordinated Federal report on the opportunities for research into the brain. As a result of the reports requested by the House Appropriations Committee 2 years ago, we have a blueprint of the needs and opportunities for brain-related research over the next 10 years.

What have we discovered already, and what are some of those future needs and opportunities?

At NINDS, we have evidence that many neurological disorders—affecting millions of Americans—could be prevented, cured, or alleviated if the opportunities we have in hand are fully investigated:

HEAD AND SPINAL INJURY

Each year, 500,000 Americans suffer head injuries severe enough to require admission to a hospital, and another 10,000 to 12,000 new victims are disabled by trauma to the spinal cord. Clinical studies have shown that much central nervous system damage can be prevented if improved patient care interventions are developed that would be available within 4 hours of the injury. Laboratory evidence also shows that damaged nerve cells can be stimulated to regenerate and function. These are critical findings which must be further studied.

BRAIN IMAGING

Brain imaging techniques such as PET and MRI are now indispensable tools for neuroscience research, responsible for much of what is known about brain activity and structure in diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, stroke, Parkinson's disease, brain tumors, and epilepsy. Increasingly, neurological scientists are expanding the scope of PET to study the higher cognitive functions of learning, thinking, and memory.

NEUROGENETICS

One-fourth of all genetic disorders affect the brain and nervous system. The boom in molecular genetics made possible the very exciting discovery of the genetic defect responsible for Duchenne's muscular dystrophy, and may lead to treatment—possibly a

cure—for the thousands of children and adults with this and other neuromuscular diseases. Neuroscientists are encouraged that this achievement could be replicated in many other neurological diseases with an increased commitment of resources.

EPILEPSY

Two million people in the United States have epilepsy. Steady progress has been made to find new drug treatments and to refine surgical therapies, but much more needs to be done to understand the various forms of epilepsy and discover more effective treatments.

STROKE

Although much has been learned about the causes and risk factors of stroke, stroke remains a major killer and crippler of hundreds of thousands of Americans each year. Recent studies show an alarming—and unexplained—rise in the incidence rate of new cases of stroke. Greater efforts are needed to identify other risk factors, develop preventive strategies, and evaluate surgical and medical treatments for stroke patients.

BASIC NEUROSCIENCE RESEARCH AND CLINICAL TRIALS

A steady commitment to basic neuroscience research has resulted in discoveries that can lead to therapies or preventive measures for many neurological and neuromuscular disorders. Additional studies in neurochemistry, neurogenetics, and other neurosciences are needed to identify the yet undiscovered secrets of the brain and the nervous system that will lead the way to further clinical advances. Vital to the transfer of laboratory results to the bedside, additional clinical trials are needed to gain the full benefit of long-term investments in basic neurosciences.

At NIMH, we have seen substantial progress in implementing the recommendations of the decade of the brain report, as follows:

CENTERS FOR NEUROSCIENCE AND SCHIZOPHRENIA

Since formulation of the Decade of the Brain Report to Congress, NIMH has initiated a program of Centers for Neuroscience and Schizophrenia. Four centers designed to integrate basic clinical neuroscience approaches to schizophrenia research are currently supported. These centers are at Yale University, University of Colorado Health Science Center, Maryland Psychiatric Research Center, Baltimore, and the University of California, Irvine.

NEUROSCIENCE WORKGROUP PROGRAM

These awards support innovative approaches to basic science questions on the frontier of mental health research. They were conceived as a mechanism to encourage the application of new fields of study and new technologies to mental health research problems—a mechanism that allows the continuous cross-fertilization of new ideas and techniques from multiple disciplines to generate novel scientific opportunities. The first Center for Neuroscience Research is currently being funded at New York University and at the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm, Sweden. A second center has been initiated at the University of Pennsylvania in collaboration with labs at Hershey, PA, Rockefeller University in New York, and the College of France in Paris, France.

RESEARCH ON CHILD AND ADOLESCENT MENTAL DISORDERS

Mental disorders affecting children and adolescents are among the highest priorities of the NIMH. These disorders include autism, attention deficit disorder and affective disorders and are estimated to affect as many as 15 percent of the children and adolescents in the United States. However, little is known about them and relatively little current research is being devoted to this growing problem. For this reason, the Director of NIMH asked the Institute of Medicine to undertake a major, comprehensive "Study of Child and Adolescent Mental Disorder Research." This study has very recently been completed, and provides specific programs and policy recommendations for a national initiative in child and adolescent mental disorders research training. It will provide the foundation for the NIMH, through the NAMHC, to develop a new "National Research Plan for Child and Adolescent Mental Disorders." The IOM's report includes numerous opportunities for neuroscience research including recent advances in identifying brain dysfunctions associated with such disorders as autism. The NIMH plan will address those opportunities.

Other topics currently under discussion and in the planning stages include the role of brain dysfunction in learning disorders, the usefulness of serial MRI in untreated multiple sclerosis patients, the role of MRI in clinical trials, clinical studies of treatment of subacute and chronic central nervous system injury resulting from stroke and trauma, and development of methods for treatment studies of vascular dementia. In addition, current plans include the integration of basic and clinical neuroscience to individual mental disorders, the application of experimental techniques and strategies from molecular biology to the field of mental health, and the use of advanced physical imaging in the study of mental illness.

I would like to thank the resolution's endorsers for all the work they did to help it along, the 248 Representatives who cosponsored it, and Senator DONALD RIEGLE of Michigan, who is the principal sponsor in the Senate. We have all worked hard to pass this resolution, and we all deserve applause.

I look forward to 10 years of progress during the 1990's, the Decade of the Brain.

Mr. Speaker, we look forward to having a big ceremony in the Rose Garden with President Bush, and because of the cooperation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], I am going to invite him there.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am overwhelmed by the gentleman's generosity, and I look forward to that invitation and thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 174

Whereas it is estimated that fifty million Americans are affected each year by disorders and disabilities that involve the brain, including the major mental illnesses; inherited and degenerative diseases; stroke; epilepsy; addictive disorders; injury resulting from prenatal events, environmental neurotoxins and trauma; and speech, language, hearing and other cognitive disorders;

Whereas it is estimated that treatment, rehabilitation and related costs of disorders and disabilities that affect the brain represent a total economic burden of $305,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas the people of the Nation should be aware of the exciting research advances on the brain and of the availability of effective treatment of disorders and disabilities that affect the brain;

Whereas a technological revolution occurring in the brain sciences, resulting in such procedures as positron emission tomography and magnetic resonance imaging, permits clinical researchers to observe the living brain noninvasively and in exquisite detail, to define brain systems that are implicated in specific disorders and disabilities, to study complex neuropeptides and behavior as well as to begin to learn about the complex structures underlying memory;

Whereas scientific information on the brain is amassing at an enormous rate, and the field of computer and information sciences has reached a level of sophistication sufficient to handle neuroscience data in a manner that would be maximally useful to both basic researchers and clinicians dealing with brain function and dysfunction;

Whereas advances in mathematics, physics, computational science, and brain imaging technologies have made possible the initiation of significant work in imaging brain function and pathology, modeling neural networks and simulating their dynamic interactions;

Whereas comprehending the reality of the nervous system is still on the frontier of technological innovation requiring a comprehensive effort to decipher how individual neurons, by their collective action, give rise to human intelligence;

Whereas fundamental discoveries at the molecular and cellular levels of the organization of the brain are clarifying the role of

the brain in translating neurophysiologic events into behavior, thought, and emotion;

Whereas molecular biology and molecular genetics have yielded strategies effective in preventing several forms of severe mental retardation and are contributing to promising break-throughs in the study of inheritable neurological disorders, such as Huntington's disease, and mental disorders, such as affective illnesses;

Whereas the capacity to map the biochemical circuitry of neurotransmitters and neuromodulators will permit the rational design of potent medications possessing minimal adverse effects that will act on the discrete neurochemical deficits associated with such disorders as Parkinson's disease, schizophrenia and Alzheimer's disease;

Whereas the incidence of neurologic, psychiatric, psychological, and cognitive disorders and disabilities experienced by older persons will increase in the future as the number of older persons increases;

Whereas studies of the brain and central nervous system will contribute not only to the relief of neurologic, psychiatric, psychological, and cognitive disorders, but also to the management of fertility and infertility, cardiovascular disease, infectious and parasitic diseases, developmental disabilities and immunologic disorders, as well as to an understanding of behavioral factors that underlie the leading preventable causes of death in this Nation;

Whereas the central nervous and immune systems are both signalling systems which serve the entire organism, and there are direct connections between the nervous and immune systems, and whereas studies of the modulatory effects of each system on the other will enhance our understanding of diseases as diverse as the major psychiatric disorders, acquired immune deficiency syndrome, and autoimmune disorders;

Whereas recent discoveries have led to fundamental insights as to why people abuse drugs, how abused drugs affect brain function leading to addiction, and how some of these drugs cause permanent brain damage;

Whereas studies of the brain will contribute to the development of new treatments that will curtail the craving for drugs, break the addictive effects of drugs, prevent the brain-mediated "high" caused by certain abused drugs, and lessen the damage done to the developing minds of babies, who are the innocent victims of drug abuse;

Whereas treatment for persons with head injury, developmental disabilities, speech, hearing, and other cognitive functions is increasing in availability and effectiveness;

Whereas the study of the brain involves the multidisciplinary efforts of scientists from such diverse areas as physiology, biochemistry, psychology, psychiatry, molecular biology, anatomy, medicine, genetics, and many others working together toward the common goals of better understanding the structure of the brain and how it affects our development, health, and behavior;

Whereas the Nobel Prize for Medicine or Physiology has been awarded to fifteen neuroscientists within the past twenty-five years, an achievement that underscores the excitement and productivity of the study of the brain and central nervous system and its potential for contributing to the health of humanity;

Whereas the people of the Nation should be concerned with research into disorders and disabilities that affect the brain, and should recognize prevention and treatment of such disorders and disabilities as a health priority; and

Whereas the declaration of the Decade of the Brain will focus needed government attention on research, treatment, and rehabilitation in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the decade beginning January 1, 1990, hereby is designated the "Decade of the Brain", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon all public officials and the people of the United States to observe such decade with appropriate programs and activities.

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

TAKE PRIDE IN THE FLAG DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 189) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that individuals throughout the United States should observe Independence Day, July 4, 1989, as "Take Pride in the Flag Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] who is the chief sponsor of House Resolution 189.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to stand before this House—the people's body—and report to my colleagues that the peoples representatives have spoken. A majority of the Members of this distinguished body have signed on in support of House Resolution 189, which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that individuals throughout the United States should observe next Tuesday, July 4, 1989, Independence Day, as "Take Pride in the Flag Day."

With the help of the national offices and directors of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, we were able to convince a majority of this body to sign on to this important and timely resolution in less than 1 week.

We all know the importance Americans place in our flag. The flag is the symbol of the freedoms we enjoy and others revere throughout the world.

Kevin Giese placed two American flags on his lawn at home in Wisconsin with a sign that warns: "Do Not Burn."

Perhaps the true feelings of Americans on this subject can best be summed up by Mike Kukler of North Carolina, a retired Army sergeant major who publishes a newsletter for Vietnam vets, when he said:

> The flag is our country. When you grew up, you raised your hand and pledged allegiance to the flag. They call us to war to fight for our flag. Here we have our Supreme Court tell us it's OK to burn our flag. I don't understand it.

I must admit I don't understand it either. But this July 4 all Americans can show their pride in the flag by displaying it at public celebrations, fireworks shows, parades, and in homes during family gatherings.

I hope Americans will fly their flags on Independence Day to show respect and responsibility—and—anyone who may want to exercise the right to desecrate our flag—that those kinds of actions are considered wrong by responsible and patriotic Americans who believe in respect for the flag and the rights it represents.

The flag is the symbol of freedom our Nation has carried to battle in the many struggles our veterans engaged in over the past 200 years in the defense of the United States of America.

The flag is the symbol of liberty and a free nation which we pledge allegiance to at the beginning of most public events—including sessions of the House of Representatives.

Other people around the country note that millions have died in service to their flag and millions more are prepared to make peacetime sacrifices for their country and their flag.

I, and many of my colleagues in this distinguished body, believe there's an overwhelming majority of Americans who want to do something now to demonstrate their respect for the flag.

This resolution allows Americans throughout the Nation to wage a "positive protest" to the recent Supreme Court ruling on flag burning this July 4.

Frank Zelazo, A 58-year-old Korean war veteran was so outraged with the Supreme Court ruling that he held a quiet protest on his lawn last Friday by flying old glory with a hand printed sign, which read: "Try Burning This Flag."

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and compliment my colleague from New Mexico. Those were beautiful words, and I want to reemphasize what the gentleman said. I believe more flags will be flown this July 4 holiday than any time since 1945 when July 4 fell between May 8, the Victory in Europe Day, and the secession of fighting in mid-August with that beautiful ceremony on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* on September 2. America was filled with a sense of mission then, and this Fourth of July is going

to accomplish I think the same thing because of one stupid, young Communist who thinks that he can inflict physical and mental harm which although we cannot quantify it, we know nevertheless it is there, and it is nonetheless real.

Last night, my colleagues, I found a poem that we all learned in grade school, "The Flag Goes By." The Congressional Library Service had sent me "Barbara Frietchie," and the very next poem I could only read half of it, and the second page was not there. So I would like to complete it today. It does not make any sense not to go back and complete the next 14 lines.

□ 1740

Mr. Speaker, the poem authored by Henry Holcomb Bennett is "The Flag Goes By."

The gentleman in the well, Mr. JACOBS, knows how good he was with this in grade school. Every time he got punished he had to memorize this.

Mr. Speaker, "The Flag Goes By," by Henry Holcomb Bennett:

THE FLAG GOES BY

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
A flash of color beneath the sky:
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

Blue and crimson and white it shines,
Over the steel-tipped, ordered lines.
Hats off!
The colors before us fly;
But more than the flag is passing by.

Sea-fights and land-fights, grim and great,
Fought to make and to save the State:
Weary marches and sinking ships;
Cheers of victory on dying lips;

Days of plenty and years of peace;
March of a strong land's swift increase;
Equal justice, right and law,
Stately honor and reverend awe;

Sign of a nation, great and strong
To ward her people from foreign wrong:
Pride and glory and honor,—all
Live in the colors to stand or fall.

Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
And loyal hearts are beating high:
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!

Happy Fourth of July, my colleagues, and thank you for that bipartisan tribute to the flag last night.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if the author would consider amending his resolution to make every day "Take Pride in Flag Day." To designate only 1 day a year makes you wonder about the other 364, in a way, does it not?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that. I think that we all take pride every day.

Mr. JACOBS. Good.

Mr. SKEEN. But in light of what happened recently, I thought it was probably appropriate to use this particular Fourth of July on a one-time basis to say we particularly emphasize the respect and the pride that we have in the flag because I know commemoratives are sometimes a real burden to Members of this body. I understand that because we commemorate so many things. I did not want to be trite, but I did want it to be special and to give some special emphasis and special reflection on just how much we really think of the American flag every day but particularly on this particular 4th.

Mr. JACOBS. I was just thinking that because of the difficulties—and by the way I support amending the Constitution so as not to be a felony but a misdemeanor for disrespecting our flag, desecrating the flag. I do not have a problem with that at all. I think that ought to be the law of the land. But it seems to me, in view of this misfortune, rather than picking 1 day and in view of the fact that people respect it every day, maybe the resolution should ask that we respect it twice every day. This cuts it down to just 1 day, and it bothers me slightly.

Mr. SKEEN. I am not going to argue the mathematics of the gentleman, and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. RIDGE. Continuing my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I just want to acknowledge that last night's special order on the flag was conceived and conducted by both Republicans and Democrats and that the sponsors of this resolution, although the resolution was introduced by a Republican colleague, was a bipartisan resolution, heavily endorsed by Members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Clearly the pride and affection and reverence which individual Members have and which the citizens whom we are privileged to represent in this body certainly maintain and feel toward the flag, equally has no political affiliation. As Americans we all revere and respect it.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman from Pennsylvania's comments. The work that has gone into this resolution by Representative SKEEN is no small amount of effort. It is reflective of the importance of the kind of work, the kind of communication all across a body as large and diverse and as complex as this House of Representatives can be. Sometimes working together, sometimes divided by tensions, but nonetheless bound together by the kind of common belief that we speak of today.

It is faith in those symbols that mean most to all of us, the kinds of symbols that represent everything that has been good about this Nation for 200 years.

The fact that the sponsor is able to execute the demands of commemorative resolution in the short span of time, 1 week, speaks not only to the quality of the effort that he has put into it, but in the commitment of the full range of his colleagues to the effort that he has made, and I thank him for it.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

Whereas the flag of the United States (the Stars and Stripes) came into being amid the strife of battle and became the standard by which a free people struggled to establish a great Nation;

Whereas the flag of the United States has carried the message of freedom to many parts of the world in battles for freedom during the past 2 centuries;

Whereas individuals in the United States, proud of the symobl of liberty and a free Nation, pledge allegiance to the flag at most public events;

Whereas the Federal Government has established and codified existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States;

Whereas in recent days many individuals in the United States, in response to a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court affecting the flag, have demanded appropriate recognition and respect for the flag; and

Whereas 1989 is the 213th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the 201st anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, which symbolize the liberties and freedoms of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that individuals throughout the United States should observe Independence Day, July 4, 1989, as "Take Pride in the Flag Day" and should engage in appropriate programs and activities—

(1) to celebrate the 213th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the 201st anniversary of the ratification of the Constitution of the United States;

(2) to recognize the flag of the United States as a symbol of freedom throughout the world; and

(3) to display the flag in celebration and recognition of the liberty and freedom individuals in the United States have enjoyed for generations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 137) designating January 7, 1990, through January 13, 1990, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply reserve the right to object in order to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. LES ASPIN, who is the chief sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 137, and I do acknowledge his work.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 137

Whereas law enforcement training and sciences related to law enforcement are critical to the immediate and long-term safety and well-being of this Nation because law enforcement professionals provide service and protection to citizens in all sectors of society;

Whereas law enforcement training is a critical component of national efforts to protect the citizens of this Nation from violent crime, to combat the malignancy of illicit drugs, and to apprehend criminals who commit personal, property, and business crimes;

Whereas law enforcement training serves the hard working and law abiding citizens of this Nation;

Whereas it is essential that the citizens of this Nation be able to enjoy an inherent right of freedom from fear and learn of the significant contributions that law enforcement trainers have made to assure such right;

Whereas it is vital to build and maintain a highly trained and motivated law enforcement work force that is educated and trained in the skills of law enforcement and sciences related to law enforcement in order to take advantage of the opportunities that law enforcement provides;

Whereas it is in the national interest to stimulate and encourage the youth of this Nation to understand the significance of law enforcement training to the law enforcement profession and to the safety and security of all citizens;

Whereas it is in the national interest to encourage the youth of this Nation to appreciate the intellectual fascination of law enforcement training; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to make the youth of this Nation aware of career options available in law enforcement and disciplines related to law enforcement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That January 7, 1990, through January 13, 1990, is designated as "National Law Enforcement Training Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate exhibits, ceremonies, and activities, including programs designed to heighten the awareness of all citizens, particularly the youth of this Nation, of the importance of law enforcement training and related disciplines.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 27, 1989.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear TOM: Enclosed is a letter I have sent to the Governor of Texas, giving official notification that I am resigning my seat in the United States House of Representatives for the 12th District of Texas, effective at the close of business Friday, June 30, 1989.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

JIM WRIGHT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the letter will be forwarded to the Governor of Texas and printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now receive 1-minute speeches.

SPIRIT WITH WHICH AMERICANS SHOULD APPROACH THE BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION NEXT WEEK

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, after giving a lot of thought, I have come to this conclusion: Protecting and defending our beloved flag by some people is best and easiest when it is politically profitable and physically safe.

Patriotism is not a matter of histrionics. It is an abiding thing, calm and steady on stormy seas as well as in the safety of the harbor.

It is with that spirit that I think Americans should approach this birthday celebration next week.

MILITARY BAND RECORDINGS

(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, I rise to announce that I plan to introduce a bill today, to amend title 10 of the United States Code, and permit recordings of military bands to be sold commercially.

I find it unpatriotic that an average American can not enjoy the musical brilliance of our military bands without seeing them here in Washington, or somewhere on tour. These bands have been referred to as the true ambassadors of our great nation. Their inspirational music deserves to be heard.

I have received letters from military music lovers all over the world asking why other nations allow commercial recordings of their service bands, yet the United States does not—when ours are so highly acclaimed. American military bands deserve their rightful place alongside those of Great Britain, Ireland, and other countries worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill, for the satisfaction of music enthusiasts in American homes, and to enhance internationally the high reputation of the U.S. military bands.

COLD FUSION EXPERIMENTS

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to report that experiments to duplicate the University of Utah's cold fusion research are proceeding favorably at a number of locations around this country and throughout the world.

The lastest public confirmation came this past week from the Los Alamos National Laboratory, where scientist Edmund Storms announced he had found significant amounts of tritium during his efforts to reproduce the experiments of Drs. Stanley Pons and Martin Fleischmann at the Unviersity of Utah. Last month, Dr. John Appleby, a chemist from Texas A&M University speaking to the Workshop

on Cold Fusion Phenonema at Los Alamos, said, "Tritium * * * can only be coming from fusion. That's the bottom line." Other successful experiments producing tritium have been reported in at least a dozen other laboratories around the world, and some experiments have also indicated a burst of neutron radiation, another telltale sign of fusion.

In a dramatic reversal of his earlier findings and his often critical statements about Pons and Fleischmann's research, Dr. Nathan Lewis of the California Institute of Technology recently revealed that his experiments, too, had produced "excess power."

The prospects for cold fusion are looking brighter and brighter and, yesterday, the University of Utah formally announced a collaborative agreement with General Electric on cold fusion research.

Drs. Pons and Fleischmann are presently in England at Southhampton University, working on a detailed scientific paper which should be released sometime in the next few months, and scaling up their experiments with larger devices and equipment.

I want to communicate to my colleagues that "cold" fusion is alive and well, being performed in increasingly larger jars in laboratories around the world. I have great confidence in Pons and Fleischmann as exceptionally able scientists and men of honesty and dedication. I believe they have discovered something so revolutionary it will yet have major implications for the pursuit of the clean energy that our polluted planet so desperately needs.

Few potentially revolutionary scientific discoveries have initially met with unreserved praise, and research into cold fusion is no exception. But, like Galileo, branded as a heretic and forced to recant his assertion that the Earth revolved around the Sun, Pons and Fleischmann may yet be able to say, "E pur si muove." And, yet, it does still move.

□ 1750

HOMOSEXUALITY

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, revelations about a male prostitution ring involving officials in the Federal Government shed new light on a very perplexing question of our day. How is it that over the course of this decade undeniably conservative administrations have been used to promote homosexuality.

Past wisdom blamed it on the strange bedfellows of politics. As if to say, "This democracy is a government of all the people." But current wisdom now suggests that the "strange bedfellow" answer should be taken more literally.

I urge President Bush to investigate this matter to its fullest and be totally honest with the American people in his findings. Maybe then we will discover why our national AIDS policy has been turned upside down, why the Federal Government insists on funding homoerotic art, and why such obvious planks of the homosexual agenda, like the "hate crimes bill," is allowed to maintain the cloak of civil rights rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, Guide magazine is one of many publications serving homosexuality in America today. Guide is the self-proclaimed homosexual magazine of the Pacific Northwest.

In November 1987, Guide ran an illuminating article on the Machiavellian tactics of the homosexual movement in their desire to gain social legitimacy. "The first order of business," begin the authors of "The Overhauling of Straight America." "is desensitization of the American public concerning gays and gay rights."

The authors explain that,

To desensitize the public is to help it view homosexuality with indifference instead of with keen emotion. Ideally, we would have straights register differences in sexual preferences the way they register different tastes for ice cream or sports games.

And with the characteristic candor of a pathologically provincial mind, the authors scheme that,

At least in the beginning, we are seeking public desensitization and nothing more. We do not need and cannot expect a full "appreciation" or "understanding" of homosexuality from the average American. You can forget about trying to persuade the masses that homosexuality is a good thing. But if only you can get them to think that it is just another thing * * * then your battle for legal and social rights is virtually won.

This is the key to the politics of the homosexual movement: Attempt to delude the public into viewing homosexuality as an innocuous alternative lifestyle, hopefully to the point where it is viewed as simply being an abstract social question in the minds of most Americans. They are actually asking Americans to believe that a man can be a homosexual without ever committing sodomy or any other intimate physical act with the same sex.

WHAT HOMOSEXUALS DO

Militant homosexuals do not want you to know of the behavior that defines their existence. They do not want you to know that the average homosexual has homosexual sex two or three times per week.

That the average homosexual has 1,000 or more sexual partners in his lifetime.

That the average homosexual has only one sexual encounter per partner and never sees the partner again after the encounter.

That the average homosexual has experienced receptive anal penetration, or the insertion of one man's penis in another man's rectum.

And that the average homosexual's favorite activities include: Receiving oral sodomy, that is putting one man's penis in another man's mouth; performing anal penetration; and participating in mutual oral sodomy. [Source: homosexualities, Alan P. Bell and Martin S. Weinberg, (Simon and Schuster) 1979.]

Other activities peculiar to homosexuality include: Rimming, or one man using his tongue to lick the rectum of another man; golden showers, having one man or men urinate on another man or men; fisting or handballing, which has one man insert his hand and/or part of his arm into another man's rectum; and using what are euphemistically termed "toys" such as one man inserting dildoes, certain vegetables, or lightbulbs up another man's rectum. [Source: San Francisco AIDS Foundation, "Can We Talk".]

PUBLIC OPINION

Militant homosexuals cringe at the thought of what these graphic images mean in the minds of most Americans. Mind you, most Americans do not view homosexual sodomy in the same light as heterosexual intercourse or even the aberration of heterosexual sodomy. One of the most recent public opinion surveys on the subject found that 81 percent of the public believes that homosexual relations are wrong. [Source: National Opinion Research Center, General Social Survey, Annual.]

BIBLICAL FOUNDATIONS

A majority of Americans still base their moral values on the same book that commands us not to "lie with mankind, as with womankind" [Leviticus 18:22] and to "Be not deceived: Neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind * * * shall inherit the kingdom of God." [1 Corinthians 6:9-10.] These Americans daily affirm the societal, if not intrinsic, value of the heterosexual ethic, or the traditional family. They are still the overwhelming majority in our society and our laws reflect this admitted bias.

THE CONSTITUTION AND MAJORITARIAN VALUES

I should take the time at this point to address this issue of bias in the form of majoritarian morality. We should all understand the significance of this American principle. All too often militant homosexuals will insist that one person's values should not be forced upon another person. And that just because a man and woman enjoy sexual intercourse does not mean that two men cannot equally enjoy sodomy, or that sexual intercourse and sodomy should not be equally valued. "Anyway," they will proclaim, "You can't legislative morality."

These are powerful arguments on their surface. The rhetoric is appealing to our libertarian senses. Afterall, this is America, a land where anyone can do as they wish provided they do no harm to another. These thoughts comprise the homosexual liturgy.

Unfortunately for the homosexual movement, these arguments are specious and totally void of historical and legal claims of jurisprudence. As recently as 1986 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that "There is not fundamental right to commit homosexual sodomy." In the case of Bowers versus Hardwick (1986), the Court boldly reaffirmed society's right to enact moral statutes of this nature.

On the one hand, the Court, through the majority concurrence of Chief Justice Warren Burger, explained the historical precedent for such prohibitions of personal conduct. Justice Burger explained that such:

Proscriptions against sodomy have very ancient roots. Decisions of individuals relating to homosexual conduct have been subject to State intervention throughout the history of western civilization. Condemnation of those practices is firmly rooted in Judeo-Christian moral and ethical standards.

Homosexual sodomy was a capital crime under Roman law. During the English Reformation when ecclesiastical courts were transferred to the King's courts, the first English statute criminalizing sodomy was passed. [In Blackstone's Legal Commentaries, he] described "the infamous crime against nature" as an offense of "deeper malignity" than rape, an heinous act "the very mention of which is a disgrace to human nature," and "a crime not fit to be named."

The common law of England, including its prohibition of sodomy, became the received law of Georgia and the other colonies. In 1816 the Georgia Legislature passed the statute at issue here, and that statute has been continuously in force in one form or another since that time.

Justice Burger concluded his concurrence by adding that, "To hold that the act of homosexual sodomy is somehow protected as a fundamental right would be to cast aside millenia of moral teaching."

On the other hand, Justice White in drafting the majority opinion took up the issue of privacy or consensual acts and public morals. Justice White wrote that:

The right pressed upon us here has no [first amendment] support in the text of the Constitution, and it does not qualify for recognition under the prevailing principles for construing the fourteenth amendment. Its limits are also difficult to discern. Plainly enough, otherwise illegal conduct is not always immunized whenever it occurs in the home.

Victimless crimes, such as the possession and use of illegal drugs do not escape the law where they are committed at home . . . and if respondent's submission is limited to the voluntary sexual conduct between consenting adults, it would be difficult, except by fiat, to limit the claimed right of homosexual conduct while leaving exposed to prosecution adultery, incest, and other sexual crimes even though they are committed in the home. We are unwilling to start down that road.

The Justice continues:

Even if the conduct at issue here is not a fundamental right, respondent asserts that there must be a rational basis for the law and that there is none in this case other than the presumed belief of the majority of the electorate in Georgia that homosexual sodomy is immoral and unacceptable. This is said to be an inadequate rationale to support the law.

The law, however, is constantly based on notions of morality, and if all laws representing essentially moral choices are to be invalidated under the due process clause, the courts will be very busy indeed. Even respondent makes no such claim, but insists that majority sentiments about the morality of homosexuality should be declared inadequate. We do not agree, and are unpersuaded that the sodomy laws of some twenty-five states should be invalidated on this basis.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS DECEPTION

Lest we be deceived by the language of civil rights today as it relates to homosexuality, I would like to quote from Dr. David Pence, a sixties radical, civil rights marcher, anti-war protester, and now a practicing physcian. His insights pierce the homosexual armor:

The road to Selma did not lead to the right to sodomy * * * Homosexual behavior is a completely different category of activity which cannot be seriously considered even an analogue of race or gender. The freedom train has been hijacked * * *

By restoring its moral foundation, the civil rights movement will no longer serve the ideologies of the last twenty years but will fulfill the democratic promise of America's first two centuries.

THE CAUSES OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Of course, all the legal and historical precedents in the world would become starkly irrelevant were homosexuals to prove that their behavior was not simply a deviant personal choice or even a psychological orientation. But if they can prove that their behavior is genetic or hereditary or somehow show that it is physiologically determined, then homosexuals may legitimately say that they have no choice in the matter thereby providing impetus to add "sexuality" to the list of protected civil rights.

The genetic explanation of homosexuality is the one that many homosexuals prefer. Most often cited is a study published back in 1952 that analyzed the histories of 37 pairs of identical twins and 26 pairs of fraternal twins and reported that in 100 percent of the cases of indentical twins where homosexuality occurred, both were homosexual, while in the fraternal twins only 12 percent of the cases were both homosexual. (Source: "Comparative Twin Study on the Genetic Aspects of Homosexuality," F.J. Kallman, 1952.)

Subsequent researchers have not been able to replicate the same findings. So what conclusions are we to draw? One writer has surmised that,

No firm conclusion can be drawn from these studies. A higher concordance rate for homosexuality in twins is not necessarily due to genetic factors, but may result from factors such as intense indentification or specific practices related to twinships. (Source: "A General Psychiatric Approach to Sexual Deviation," Anthony Wakeling, 1979)

Others have chosen to focus on the effects of hormonal androgens and testosterone to make their case. None of these studies has provided the scientific fruits necessary to lay claim to a homosexual-from-birth principle.

I have found that homosexual activists are simply unwilling to acknowledge the complexity of their own sad plight. They want so desperately to believe they are normal and natural in what they do that they snatch at any theory that seems to support that idea, ignoring the enormous body of opinion among medical clinicians that tells a different and less satisfying tale.

A significant proportion of clinicians actively engaged in treating patients still believe that homosexuality is, in most cases, an abnormal condition and, in some cases, a serious mental disorder. Others in this category believe that it is no more than an alternative way of behaving, like left-handedness. But all reject the idea that homosexual behavior is inherited or instinctual.

THE CRASHING OF THE APA

Militant homosexuals knew that social progression in this environment of diagnostic ambiguity was tentative at best. They became restless and impatient to the point that the politics of diagnosis took a dramatic turn in 1973 when the movement was able to molest the senses of the American Psychiatric Association [APA] into removing homosexuality from the official list of mental illnesses.

I recently read a powerful narrative detailing this occasion. The event has provided fodder for the homosexual movement ever since. The author of the narrative, far from being a so-called homophobe, is an apologist for homosexuality and a political advocate of the movement. (Source: Homosexuality and American Psychiatry, Ronald Bayer.)

In brief, a group of homosexuals stormed the APA annual convention on successive years in the early seventies and, with deliberately disruptive tactics, actually forced the psychiatrists to accede to their demands and declare homosexuality a normal condition. In effect, the nature of medical opinion was altered by strong-arm tactics. If you doubt that homosexuality should have remained on the APA's list of mental illnesses, you have only to read this account of how it was removed.

After describing the growing tendency toward disruption and violence in homosexual activism, the author tells us that because the APA convention of 1970 was being held in San Francisco, the homosexual leadership decided to focus their attack on that particular organization. And as he puts it, "guerrilla theater tactics and more straightforward shouting matches characterized their presence."

Panel after panel at the 1970 convention was used by the homosexual to shout expletives and comments like, "where did you take your residence, Auschwitz?" Each successive annual convention brought more of the same until, by 1973, the association's all-important nomenclature committee determined that, "Homosexual behavior was not necessarily a sign of psychiatric disorder, and that the diagnostic manual should reflect that understanding."

Since the time homosexuality was removed from the official list of mental illnesses in 1973, pedophilia has also been stricken from the list, except when the adult who has intercourse with children feels "subjective distress." If the past is any indication of the future, in the next few years what we have known as child molesting will be officially termed a normal variant of human sexuality and its practitioners will successfully argue before a quaking group of psychiatrists that any mention of pedophilia in the profession's diagnostic manual would be cruel and discriminatory.

THE HEALTH OF HOMOSEXUALS

If legal grounds, historical grounds, moral grounds, and medical grounds do not provide enough reasons to quell the homo-hysteria that has been unleashed on the public over the last 30 years, perhaps the health reasons will.

Homosexuals are among the most unhealthy of demographic groups. Historically, their bowels have been full of the bulk of enteric diseases in America. Syphilis, gonorrhea, and hepititas B have been the mainstays of their viral menu. And, of course, AIDS has saturated and nearly decimated their ranks.

Homosexuals and their sympathetic media are quick to point out that exposure to venereal diseases, including AIDS have dramatically declined as a result of behavior modification. But as the voice of experience has told us, there are liars, damn liars, and statisticians.

I sincerely hope that homosexuals have modified their sexual behavior. However this hope and seeming statistical evidence belie common sense as well as conflicting evidence. We cannot fairly compare apples and oranges. Homosexual claims that venereal diseases have skyrocketed in the heterosexual community while declining among homosexuals misses the point entirely. The comparison that needs to be made is not among promiscuous or illicit heterosexual sex versus homosexual sodomy. We should begin to compare traditional heterosexual sex versus both promiscuous heterosexual sex and homosexual sodomy.

In other words, stack up the sex-related physical health of a man and woman who have come together in the bonds of a mutually faithful monogamous marriage versus the sex-related physical health of any other type of sexual relationship. Then, and only then, will we get a true picture what behavior is healthy and what behavior is unhealthy.

As it stands, statistical records allow homosexuals to compete medically with their promiscuous heterosexual counterparts. This is like two alcoholics competing for sobriety.

If common sense does not compel a reassessment of how we look at the health of the homosexual community, we are only left to revert to other conflicting studies. One study for instance examined the records of certain hospitals over a 2-year period and found that 3-4 percent of all cases of gonorrhea were among male homosexuals. The same group was accountable for nearly 60 percent of the cases of syphilis. And that of all admissions other than sexually transmitted diseases, homosexuals were accountable for 17 percent. Remember that homosexuals themselves claim they are only 10 percent of the population. In this study anyway, homosexuals represent a percentage of disease far beyond their actual numbers. (Source: "Changes in Sexual Behavior and Incidence of Gonorrhea," Lancet, April 25, 1987.)

Flying in the face of safe sex rhetoric are recordbreaking cases of AIDS in San Francisco. The 1988 monthly average number of AIDS cases reported in that city was 133. In March of 1989 the count was an astounding 193 new cases, only to be topped by an April figure of 207 new cases. The city's health services are now pushed to the limit in caring for the sick.

If it's not AIDS afflicting the homosexual community it will be other venereal diseases as previously mentioned along with the likes of gay bowel syndrome, a particularly vile grouping of infections attacking the intestinal tract, tuberculosis, and cytomegalovirus.

It is the onset of AIDS and the generally unhealthy lives of homosexuals that have given me insight to their enslaving pathology. They attack morality and virtue at every turn even though these positive characteristics can incite the very behaviors they need to stay healthy and alive. The unavoidable question to be posed is, why do homosexuals continue in their deleterious ways? Perhaps society will never come to a consensus on this question.

HOMOSEXUALS WELL-PLACED TO INFLUENCE SOCIETY

What can be discussed, however, is the fact that the homosexual movement refuses to be deterred in advancing their cause. Though comparatively few in number, homosexuals are well-placed in society to perpetuate their chosen behavior. Beyond the obvious fields of entertainment, literature, and certain creative occupations, they have systematically entered professional fields.

If homosexuals need bias within medicine, they can muster a group of homosexual physicians to add credibility.

If homosexuals need bias within public health, they can call on a legion of homosexual bureaucrats, clinicians, and researchers.

If homosexuals need bias within mental health, they will find a motherlode of homosexual psychiatrists at their disposal.

If homosexuals need bias within our legal structure, they can get the pro bono services of a number of homosexual legal firms and foundations.

If homosexuals need bias in the social sciences, academia provides an endless breeding ground for homosexual apologists.

If homosexuals need bias in the news media, the editorial boards of most of the major media outlets inevitably sprout a homosexual or two.

If homosexuals need bias in politics, they need look no further for policial cover than the conclaves of both political parties, especially the Democratic Party.

THE POLITICAL AGENDA

Their social agenda is clear: destigmatize, legitimize, and gain privilege. They say they seek equality, but the very nature of their existence only lends itself to contention as they move their way into the value system of middle America. They ask for something they can only achieve through despotism—forcing Americans to accept homosexual sodomy as they do their own heterosexuality. What begins as a call for equality will naturally lead to a call for privilege.

One activist incited a throng of homosexuals during a march on Washington by proclaiming that:

> We are no longer seeking just a right to privacy and a protection from wrong. We also have a right—as heterosexual Americans already have—to see government and society affirm our lives. . . (October 1987 rally)

At the Federal level of Government, the homosexual movement seeks to:

Amend all Federal civil rights acts, other legislation, and Government controls to prohibit discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, and public services.

Prohibit the military from excluding homosexuals entrance in the armed services.

Prohibit discrimination in the Federal civil services because of sexual orientation in hiring and promoting.

Encourage Federal funds to support sex education promoting homosexuality.

At the State level of government, they are asking for the:

Repeal of all laws governing the age of sexual consent.

Enactment of legislation so that child custody, adoption, visitation rights, and foster parenting shall not be denied because of sexual orientation or marital status.

Enactment of legislation prohibiting insurance companies from screening applicants based on their sexual orientation.

Repeal of all State sodomy laws.

The Democratic Party has wholly incorporated affirmative action policies into their national and State party platforms. Rule 5C of the National Democratic Party by-laws now reads that:

Each State party shall develop and submit party outreach programs for such groups identified [including lesbians and gay men] in their plans, including recruitment, education, and training in order to achieve full participation by such groups in the delegate selection process and at all levels of party affairs.

Seventy-three Members of the House of Representatives, 69 Democrats and 4 Republicans, have sponsored a bill to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act to include sexual preference as a protected civil right. (See appendix A for list of Members.)

The political clout of the homosexual movement can be measured by their high ranking among prosperous political action committees. In 1987, the Human Rights Campaign Fund ranked ninth among independent PAC's taking in just over $1 million in contributions.

HOMOSEXUAL INFLUENCE IN AIDS POLICY

But this clout is nowhere more present or more intimidating than in the struggle to stop the spread of AIDS. The irony of their position, however, is that they oppose every public health strategy designed to impede the progress of the virus.

They are opposed to confidential reporting. They prefer to remain anonymous and unaccountable.

They are opposed to routine testing. They prefer to remain uninformed and, hence, psychologically protected.

They oppose legal restrictions on the knowing transmission of the virus. They prefer to pass the virus at will if they so choose.

They oppose proscriptions on blood donations. They prefer to be able to donate when and where they wish no matter the risks involved.

They are opposed to contact tracing. They prefer not to run the risk of being embarrassed or held accountable for wanton transmissions.

In sum, homosexuals oppose the very time-tested public health procedures that will save their lives. They prefer to protect their lifestyle rather than protect their lives. This pathology is why homosexuality was considered, and should still be considered, a mental illness. They remain a walking, public and mental health time-bomb.

HOPE FOR OVERCOMING HOMOSEXUALITY

But homosexuals are not left without hope for a better and healthier life. A majority of doctors and psychotherapists treat homosexuals every day to reverse this devastating pathology. These professionals are dedicated to the proposition that all homosexuals are able to be helped.

Many outreach programs exist to provide homosexuals and former homosexuals with support to change and remain changed in their behavior. Some are religious in nature and some are not. These groups include Regeneration in Baltimore, MD, White Stone Ministries in Boston, MA, Desert Stream in Santa Monica, CA, Life in New York City, Exodus International, headquartered in San Rafael, CA, and Beyond Rejection Ministries, in Orange County, CA. Each of these can provide help for homosexuals and/or victims of AIDS.

CLOSING COMMENTS

In closing, we have allowed the tactics of the militant homosexuals to confuse us with appeals to our sense of fairness, with false scientific data, with litigation in courts at every level, and with threats against the public order—all simultaneously. And instead of responding as a united people, we have either surrendered at the outset or else responded in one of several inappropriate ways.

We have tried to ignore the phenomenon in hopes that it will go away. It won't. We must either defeat militant homosexuality or it will defeat us. They have made it clear: we have no third choice.

Many opponents of homosexuality have resorted to name-calling and ridicule, confirming in the eyes of fair-minded people that we are as hard-hearted as homosexuals say we are. In taking this tactic, we deny the humanity of other children of God and forfeit our right to speak as the true keepers of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

We have also attempted to compromise our principles, reaffirming our opposition to homosexual conduct while arguing that under the Constitution we have no right to forbid them much of what they want. Such tactics, however, fail to recognize the essential soundness of our Constitution and its spiritual heritage. We do not have to concede a single point to the homosexual movement, so long as we retain our sense of charity and our capacity to love even those who want to destroy the social foundation of America.

Americans are extremely tolerant. We tend to ignore the consensual relationships of adults behind closed doors. However, when that behavior seeks to find the light of day, out among the public, then Americans become concerned. And it is on this point that homosexuals have at least my attention.

As long as I have the pleasure to serve in the U.S. Congress, I will continue to affirm the heterosexual ethic at every turn, with every subtly, with every bit of imagery I can conjure, with the help of good people across this Nation, as well as with the help of a majority of my colleagues in Congress, and also by the grace of God.

DISTRESS OVER ADMINISTRATION CONTACTS WITH PLO

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dismay and annoyance with the report today that the Bush administration has apparently secretly expanded their contacts with the PLO, with the Ambassador, U.S. Ambassador to Tunisia, meeting at least twice in Tunis with the PLO second highest official, Salah Khalaf. State Department officials confirmed this today. Mr. Khalaf is also known as Abu Iyad, and indicted yesterday in Italy for selling PLO guns to the Red Brigade.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words, and since the time the PLO purported to recognized Israel's right to exist, they have committed no less than 8 terrorist attacks against the State of Israel. I certainly think that the plan that Prime Minister Shamir has put forward for the West Bank and Gaza certainly should be met with happiness, and I think that the PLO certainly has not yet accepted this. I think that they really ought to be called to task for it. We ought to make sure they do the things they say they are going to do, instead of secretly expanding contacts with them when all they have done in the Middle East is promote terrorism and speak out of both sides of their mouth.

INTRODUCTION OF INNOCENT LANDOWNER DEFENSE AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the legislative process

is finetuning laws as so that people understand how to implement them. Today I introduced the Innocent Landowner Defense Amendments of 1989. Designed to make a technical correction to a very confusing provision in the superfund law.

When Congress passed the Sara amendments in 1986, it added a narrow exemption from the law's liability. This exemption, known as the innocent landowners defense, has been the subject of considerable debate in the real estate, lending, and environmental communities because no one seems to understand one of the conditions for the defense, a phrase requiring a purchaser of commercial real estate to do all appropriate inquiry into the previous uses of the property.

My legislation will address this problem by establishing three basic steps a purchaser should take to satisfy this condition.

I am confident the legislation is an evenhanded approach to a very difficult problem. It creates no new exemption from superfund liability. Instead it spells out the rules of the game to the real estate and lending communities and in the process helps to fulfill one of the basic mandates of the superfund law, stopping the transfer of contaminated property. For this reason, it is badly needed environmental legislation.

WHAT IS THE BUSH POSITION ON VRA'S?

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the largest steel-producing district in the United States, I rise to express my dismay that President Bush is unprepared to announce his position on the extension of the steel Voluntary Restraint Agreement [VRA] Program. This situation has been widely reported and was graphically illustrated in yesterday's Washington Post. I hope that President Bush will extend the VRA's for another 5 years. In any event, it is imperative that he announce immediately how he intends to extend the VRA Program, especially since he stated that he would support an extension during last year's election campaign.

September 30, 1989 is the termination date of the current VRA Program. Steel users have been and will continue to place orders for delivery during the last quarter of this year and early 1990. Until the administration announces the terms of a renewed VRA Program, contracts arranged for delivery after October 1, 1989 could circumvent the new import regulations. In the meantime, we can expect a possible surge in imports.

What will be the result of this activity? Looking back to what happened with the implementation of the 1984 VRA Program, it is likely that foregin steel producers affected by the VRA's will be permitted to ship all of the steel for which they have orders, regardless of the terms negotiated in the new agreements. More importantly, the contracts now being negotiated—which will result in higher levels of imports—will give the foreign steel producers unintended leverage in the negotiation of new VRA's and distort the intended purpose of the new VRA's. This unpalatable scenario can be avoided only by a timely announcement of the administration's position on VRA's.

More than 120 of my colleagues have joined me in urging the President to move quickly to fulfill his campaign pledge to extend the steel VRA program. I ask my other colleagues to join us. Acting swiftly on this important matter will enable the U.S. trade representative to negotiate the new VRA's, and permit a smooth and orderly transition to the new program. This would allow for minimal disruptions in the market, and ensure the continued progress of the U.S. steel industry.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE BECK DECISION

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 1-year anniversary of the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision in the case of Beck versus the Communication Workers of America. The court declared that workers cannot be forced to contribute to political causes they do not support.

For years, American workers have been forced to contribute to political causes and candidates they oppose through compulsory union dues. Harry Beck objected to this practice and it took him 12 long years to get the courts to agree to protect his rights.

While I recognize that no one should get a free ride and benefit from labor management's bargaining representation by not paying their fair share of the cost, I believe that workers who pay either union dues or the substitute agency fee should have the right, if they so choose, to pay only that portion of the dues that cover collective bargaining costs—and not for political causes and other activities they do not support.

My bill, H.R. 2589, the Workers Political Rights Act of 1989, protects the political rights of the worker by requiring union administrators to notify each employee that they may pay a reduced agency fee, limited solely to costs associated with collective bargaining matters, instead of joining the union and paying the full union dues which may be used for political purposes.

An estimated $355 million was spent on political activities by union leaders without one penny of it appearing on any disclosure forms.

Clearly, this is constitutionally and morally wrong! And the American people know it's wrong!

While contributing to candidates and political causes that are in line with one's own beliefs is truly a basic American right, such political contributions should be voluntary. Let the worker know how his money is being used. Let the worker decided how to spend his own money. Support workers' political rights. Support H.R. 2589.

A TRIBUTE TO JIM WRIGHT

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, the largest attendance ever for the weekly House prayer breakfast was at this morning's meeting in the Members' dining room of the U.S. Capitol.

The Speaker—JIM WRIGHT, the longtime House Member, majority leader, and House Speaker.

JIM WRIGHT, whose outstanding service in this House for 34½ years comes to an end tomorrow, received two prolonged, standing ovations at the House prayer breakfast this morning.

As was expected, Speaker WRIGHT was tremendous in his 30-minute presentation.

Speaker WRIGHT quoted the words from Romans 8:28—"And we know that all things work together for good to them who love the Lord."

Believing those words and knowing JIM WRIGHT, I predict for our beloved colleague from the 12th District of Texas many years of happiness and success in JIM WRIGHT's life after Congress.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A WORLD WAR II VETERANS' MEMORIAL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, I along with 72 of our colleagues am introducing legislation today to establish in Washington, DC, a World War II Veterans' Memorial. It is a modified version of H.R. 537 which would have established a World War II Veterans' Memorial and Museum.

Over the past year, I have spoken with many people—other Members, museum curators, the director of the Museum of American History—about H.R. 537. In those discussions, I have found a great deal of support for a World War II Veterans' Memorial but significant reservations expressed about building a permanent museum dedicated to World War II at a time of very limited Federal budgets.

I still firmly believe that a museum about World War II would be a wonderful way to teach future generations about the meaning of that war and the ideals of freedom and liberty for which our Nation fought. However, I understand the concerns of those who feel that we may not be able to afford at this time such an extensive endeavor as a new museum would represent.

This new bill will still authorize the establishment of a World War II Veterans' Memorial in our Nation's Capital. But it will simply express the sense of Congress that, during the 50th anniversary of World War II, in the years 1991 through 1995, the Federal Government, through the Smithsonian Institution, should encourage and promote appropriate exhibitions and commemorations in honor of our World War II veterans. It also encourages commemorations that reflect this Nation's participation in a conflict that reshaped the international geopolitical landscape as well as our Nation's economic, political, and cultural institutions.

The new bill will still be modeled after the authorizing legislation for the Korean Veterans' Memorial. It will direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish a World War II Veterans' Memorial and establish an advisory board to promote, encourage donations to, and recommend sites and design for the memorial as well as to report to Congress yearly on the progress of the memorial. It is still also my intention that this memorial be funded largely through private donations. Thus the bill creates a fund for collection and investment of this private money. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations as necessary for the initial start-up costs of the board and memorial. Last year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated the Government's cost of H.R. 537 at roughly $1 million a year so the measure without the museum element is likely to be less.

I hope that other Members of the House will join us in cosponsoring this legislation to provide the recognition that is long overdue to our World War II veterans.

ORIGINAL COSPONSORS

G.V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY, CHARLES BENNETT, VIN WEBER, LANE EVANS, CLAUDE HARRIS, JIM JONTZ, JOHN ROWLAND, RON WYDEN, JOHN RHODES, FRANK HORTON, WALTER FAUNTROY, JOHN PORTER, NICK JOE RAHALL, BEN BLAZ, W.G. "BILL" HEFNER, MARGE ROUKEMA, JERRY COSTELLO, MERVYN DYMALLY, PETER DEFAZIO, DAVID MCCURDY, HOWARD WOLPE, GARY ACKERMAN, DAVID PRICE, ALBERT BUSTAMANTE, ROBERT LAGOMARSINO, JOHN MURTHA, BARBARA BOXER, EARL HUTTO, BRUCE MORRISON, WILLIAM CLINGER, ESTEBAN TORRES, MARY ROSE OAKAR, LEON PANETTA, E. KIKA, DE LA GARZA, CARDISS COLLINS, WILLIAM PAXON, TIM VALENTINE, CHET ATKINS, MIKE ANDREWS, CHARLES HAYES, JACK BUECHNER, ROBERT MATSUI, DANTE FASCELL, FLOYD SPENCE, FRANK MCCLOSKEY, JIM SAXTON, LAWRENCE SMITH, WILLIAM FORD, EDWARD ROYBAL, H. MARTIN LANCASTER, RON DE LUGO, WES WATKINS, GUS SAVAGE, WALTER JONES, BILL SARPALIUS, RICK BOUCHER, GUS YATRON, VIC FAZIO, DICK DURBIN, WILLIAM COYNE, JIM HAYES, PORTER GOSS, ROBERT C. SMITH (NH), BEN ERDREICH, HOWARD NIELSON, WILLIAM LIPINSKI, NANCY PELOSI, JAIME FUSTER, TOM BEVILL, CHARLES WILSON, DENNIS HERTEL, TOM LANTOS.

MEMORABLE POINTS FROM THE "OLD GLORY" VIGIL

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have one final thought on our great colors, the national ensign, "Old Glory," our flag. In all of the vigil last night, the image that stayed with me throughout the day in a somewhat sleepy condition was the mental picture created by our Republican leader, BOB MICHEL, mentioning how in the early invasion days to liberate Europe from Nazi Germany our soldiers for identification purposes wore an American flag on their shoulders.

What suddenly hit me was the image of young American paratroopers from the 82d and 101st Airborne, those unfortunate enough to come down on or near a Panzer division that was going through maneuvers in the area just behind the beaches in Normandy, and some of them were machinegunned in trees and they died there hanging in those trees and were not cut down until American forces moved in from the beaches the next day.

It hit me that the first flags to fly over any piece of liberated or occupied Europe were the flags sewn to the combat fatigue jackets of those young paratroopers, their bodies swinging from those trees throughout the night, and then in the early morning hours, the light showing to the French people that were about to be liberated the fact that the Americans were finally here, that the invasion was taking place, and those flags were flying that were attached to the suits of those dead American heroes. That is an image that I will not forget from last night.

I hope that every American flies "Old Glory" proudly. I will see some of you on the "Phil Donahue Show" this morning, where I will meet America's prime Communist defending lawyer, Bill Kuntzler, probably our colleague, DON EDWARDS, who is not-hot-to-trot on an amendment to protect our flag. So we will go around a few on the merits. And probably there will be Joey Johnson, this young man who is probably going to stupidly dump communism in a few years and come to love his country again, if he ever did. I am sure that he is not aware that he has probably sold more American flags than any American since Abraham Lincoln.

A HAPPY FOURTH OF JULY EVERYBODY

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I cut my 60 minutes down to 5 minutes because I do not intend to speak any longer until maybe sometime when we are back in session about our great American flag and this peculiar Supreme Court ruling. They are all honorable men, and there is one honorable woman over there, but they split on that decision 5 to 4 in a very strange way. I still, after reading the Justices' report on the majority over and over again, cannot see how the logic escaped them that, for a handful of insensitive cretins who hurt so many hundreds of thousands of people, they could come up with that decision. But we can do that when we get back and think back over a beautiful Fourth of July holiday, with hopefully everybody exercising as much safety as they can to protect their families. And to those who do not have families and intend to drink, I say, please exercise safety so we do not read these horrible stories of an American family wiped out by some thoughtless drunk.

What I want to do in these few moments is to talk about the unsung heroes in this beautiful Capitol building, the citadel of liberty, and all of its surrounding and support buildings, and I will name just a handful.

□ 1810

The staff, the support staff that publishes our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, starting from the moment a word comes out of a Congressman or woman's mouth and is reported here at this table, to all of those downstairs who research and find the proper spelling for some obscure Asian or European village; they were there last

night looking for Ste-Mere-Eglise, a little French town where airborne soldiers fought, and some died the night before the June 6 invasion of 1944.

I had an idea that with all the help I do for my constituents to get them flags flown over this beautiful Capitol, and we have had a run on flags around here for this fourth of July, as I said in my 1 minute earlier, I am going to secure 17 flags, maybe more, if some more names turn up, and fly these flags over the Capitol on July 4 itself so that next July 4 all of these staffers that my colleagues see, our reporters and their whole team, will have a flag to fly at home next fourth of July that flew over the Capitol on Fourth of July of 1989.

So, reporters: Charles Gustafson, Susan Hanback, Tab Redling, Tony Tartaro, Katie Jane Teel, Judith Mazur, and, last, but not least, Chris Heil who tagged me with the moniker, "the Fighter with a Heart." All of the transcribers; we see them sometimes on the floor sometimes with great world leaders and the President during his state of the Union message. They are unsung heroes; God bless them for being so patient with us last night, and I will have a flag to present to every one of them when they come back.

Make that 18 flags, and let me throw in one person, took care of me up in New York on the 200th anniversary of George Washington's inaugural. It was a great day with President Bush up there helping us all realize what a great two centuries we have had since our first President was sworn in. Tim Keating in the back there, thanks for taking care of me. I am going to fly a flag for you over the Capitol.

Now for the transcribers down below, those we do not see but type our so-called words of wisdom all night: Tony Jackubosky, Pat Vasselo; forgive me if I wrecked that name, Pat; Karen Ilsemann, John Ulmer, Mary Wood, Barbara Wilmoth, Marian van den Berg.

The record clerks at the desk: Ed White, George Russell, Dick Creeger; some of these people have been here since I came here in 1977, and for all the unsung heroes in the cloakrooms, clerks at the rostrum, if they want to give me their names, I will fly a flag over the Capitol on July 4 for them and proudly present it to them so that they can have it until it wears out, and, if I am still here, I will get them a new one in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all these people on our staff, "God bless all of you. Happy Fourth of July."

VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the administration of the short supply provisions of the Voluntary Restraint Agreements [VRA] has become the focus of much of the debate over whether the Steel Import Stabilization Act of 1984 should be extended. Steel consumers have argued that short supply decisions have taken too long, particularly in 1986 and the early part of 1987. Steel producers are concerned that certain consumers, by filing inflated requests, have tried to use the short supply process as a means of undermining the import limits established by the VRA's.

The entire Utah congressional delegation supports extension of the VRA's for 5 years. We believe that after the flood of unfair imports which damaged the U.S. steel industry in the early 1980's was checked by the VRA's, the industry has made tremendous efforts to modernize and become competitive in the world market. Nowhere is this more evident than the case of Geneva Steel in Provo, UT. Under the VRA program, this mill, which employs 2,400 people, has become a nationally recognized success story and represents future for American steel and industrial competitiveness. Five more years of this program are necessary to allow modernization to be completed and to persuade our trading partners to enter into a workable and enforceable international agreement to eliminate the unfair trade practices which prevent free market forces from operating in international steel trade.

The problems that have arisen in the administration of the short supply provisions of the VRA's from the perspective of consumers should not be used as a means of weakening future VRA's. These problems can be dealt with through the legislative or regulatory process without destroying the effectiveness of the entire VRA program. For example, the problems of delays in decisionmaking on short supply requests has been addressed recently in a bill introduced by my colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON.

There are problems in the short supply process that must also be addressed from the steel producers' perspective. In particular, several steel consumers appear to have abused the short supply process by filing inflated requests as demonstrated by their failure to utilize the full amount of short supply authorized by the Department of Commerce, and their failure to purchase steel from bona fide domestic suppliers. In 1988, for example, Commerce authorized imports of 1.2 million tons of steel under the short supply process, but only 609,000 tons, or approximately 50 percent of that authorized, was actually imported. Moreover, in at least one instance, semifinished steel imported pursuant to short supply authorization was sold from inventory by a steel consumer. Ironically, many of the same consumers who have been guilty of these practices are the ones demanding "reform" of the short supply system.

The legislation I am introducing today seeks to redress the abuses that have resulted from attempts to circumvent the limits imposed by the VRA's through short supply requests. It provides disincentives to inflated requests and to efforts to create short supply by rejection of legitimate offers by domestic producers to supply steel products. The bill gives guidance to the Secretary of Commerce on the circumstances in which price may be taken into account in determining short supply. The bill requires verification of the domestic producers' costs and evidence that the prices offered by a domestic producer are substantially above market.

The bill also would cut off access to short supply for any product restricted under a bilateral VRA or an overall product ceiling, such as the semifinished quota, if there is a company-specific exemption in effect for that product. In 1984, Tuscaloosa Steel obtained exclusive access to additional imports of semifinished steel above the limit set for that product category. Several companies are now seeking such an exemption from import restraints for particular products under the future VRA's. In reality, these exemptions are short supply authorization made without the benefit of scrutiny by the Department of Commerce and without regard to market condition. I believe requests for product categories already subject to increase through this type of arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, the VRA's have given the U.S. industry some degree of the stability required for modernization to proceed. The program should be renewed for an additional 5 years in a manner which takes into account the needs of both producers and consumers and does not provide an unfair advantage to either group.

OUR FLAG

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, in response to the recent Supreme Court decision concerning the burning of the U.S. flag, I was proud to add my name as a cosponsor to House Joint Resolution 305, a bill to propose an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag and to set criminal penalties for such action. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this legislation to reaffirm our commitment to preserving the honor, glory, and integrity of this precious symbol of our Nation.

Our flag is very special to most Americans. On June 14, in a Flag Day ceremony held by the Village of Harwood Heights, located in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am honored to represent, Village President Ray Willas gave a stirring and inspirational speech on the meaning of our Nation's flag. This speech, written by Lori Berg of his staff, truly captures the special and important significance our flag has for all of our citizens.

In light of the recent Supreme Court decision concerning the burning of the flag of the United States, I would like to share this Flag Day address with my colleagues in the House of Representatives. Village President Ray Willas' address serves as an appropriate reminder of what our flag, the symbol of the United States, means to most Americans.

The text of Mayor Willas' speech follows:

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER

"Oh Say can you see by the Dawn's early light what so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming."

America's Flag in battle, America's Flag in victory. Francis Scott Key wrote the words that became our Country's national anthem. We try to remember these words at ball games. Yet no matter how difficult the song may be to sing, there is no doubt, that it is our Flag * * * our Star Spangled Banner, which is the symbol of our liberty, the symbol of our freedom.

Our country was founded with the idea of providing a harbor of liberty. A place for people to exist independent from the state. It is our constitution that guarantees those precious freedoms, but it is our flag which represents those freedoms.

No other symbol is as well recognized, as well understood as the United States Flag.

"Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous night o'er the ramparts we watched were so galantly streaming."

13 red stripes, 13 white stripes. 50 stars. 50 bright stars. 50 states united into one country.

Today we see the Red, White and Blue everywhere. In our clothes, in our advertisements, wallpaper, bathing suits, floral arrangements. The Stars and Stripes have become our country's favorite advertising media campaign. It tells everyone that the product being sold is "All American".

But think too, of what those colors those stars, and those stripes represent for people from other lands. Think of our ancestors who came to this country, a foreign land. Dreams are meant to come true in America.

From the pilgrims seeking religious freedom, to the Irish immigrants seeking a new livelihood, to the Soviet refugees looking for a democratic form of government—America is the land where one does not just think of these privileges, one actually experiences these privileges.

Imagine for the moment, the emotion these people must feel when they see our Star Spangled Banner. Feel if you will, the pain each has endured to transplant their lives here. The languages may be foreign. The customs probably different. But each with one unifying goal; to be entitled to the rights promised by the Flag. The Broad Stripes and the Bright Stars.

"And the rockets red glare, the bombs bursting in air. Gave proof through the night that our Flag was still there."

While some may envy our freedoms, others constantly threaten them. Wars are fought in the name of God, in the name of the King, in the name of dictators. But to the men and women battling for the United States, it has been our Flag for which they are fighting. That is what we defend. Should terrorists trample our Flag, we will defend it. Should our enemies tear our Flag down, we will raise it again. We will fight without end to ensure that our Flag is still there, and will always be there.

"Oh say does that star spangled Banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Yes, the banner still waves. It waves on the moon, it waves on embassies across the globe. It waved 444 times for our hostages in Iran. It waives for every new citizen and it waves for every one of us.

The flag has, for 200 years now, waved for everyone seeking freedom. It calls out to everyone, inviting those who seek to come here and find.

Other countries may be blessed with fewer problems than we see today. They may not have the crime we experience, there may not be the homeless that there is here.

But the wonderful reason for our flag is that it encourages everyone, everywhere to be free, to be independent. To take our problems and find a solution.

Lets keep the Flag waving o'er the land of the Free and the home of the brave, for everyone here today and everyone to come.

POLISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH OCTOBER 1989

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, I have introduced legislation which designated October as Polish American Heritage Month. I am introducing a similar resolution today.

I would like to thank my colleagues and fellow Polish Americans, BILL LIPINSKI of Illinois and GERRY KLECZKA of Wisconsin, for the time and effort they spent in helping me gather support for this legislation. I appreciate their support.

Mr. Speaker, Polish American Heritage Month will focus attention on the great contributions that Poles and Polish Americans made to American history.

Poles fought beside Americans from the very beginning of our struggles for liberty. Their willingness to fight for freedom links Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who helped the Revolutionary Army win the Battle of Saratoga, with Lech Walesa and the many other Solidarity activists who continue to inspire us with their activities in Poland today.

Like many of the peoples who journeyed to America from dozens of different nations, the millions of Poles who immigrated to this country made important contributions to all aspects of American life. Throughout nearly three centuries of immigration, they have been leading businessmen, athletes, artists, and religious leaders. Poles continue to be leaders in all walks of American life today.

Polish American Heritage Month will establish a time to remember the history and values that Poles and Americans share. The history is rich and varied. It includes our most basic beliefs in liberty and freedom.

As a Polish American, I am proud to introduce this important joint resolution to designate October 1989, as "Polish American Heritage Month."

H.J. RES. 347

Joint resolution to designate October 1989 as "Polish American Heritage Month"

Whereas the first Polish immigrants to North America were among the settlers of Jamestown, Virginia, in the 17th century;

Whereas Kazimierz Pulaski, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, and other Poles came to the British colonies in America to fight in the Revolutionary War and to risk their lives and fortunes for the creation of the United States;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent have distinguished themselves by contributing to the development of arts, sciences, government, military service, athletics, and education in the United States;

Whereas the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was directly modeled on the Constitution of the United States, is recognized as the second written constitution in history, and is revered by Poles and Americans of Polish descent;

Whereas Americans of Polish descent and Americans sympathetic to the struggle of the Polish people to regain their freedom remain committed to a free and independent Polish nation;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent take great pride in and honor the achievements of the greatest son of Poland, His Holiness Pope John Paul II;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent take great pride in the achievements of Nobel Peace Prize laureate Lech Walesa and the Solidarity Labor Federation; and

Whereas the Polish American Congress is observing its 45th anniversary this year and is celebrating October 1989 as Polish American Heritage Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1989 is designated as "Polish American Heritage Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

COSPONSORS OF H.J. RES. 347

Representatives Ackerman, Akaka, Anderson, Andrews, Alexander, Annunzio, Applegate, Aspin, Atkins, Bates, Beilenson, Bentley, Bevill, Berman, Bliley, Boggs, Bonior, Bosco, Boucher, Boxer, Brooks, Broomfield, Browder, Brown, (CO), Bruce, Bryant, Bustamante, Cardin, Carper, Carr, Chapman, Clement, Clinger, Collins, Conyers, Courter, Costello, Coyne, Crockett, Darden, DeFazio, de la Garza, Dellums, de Lugo, DeWine, Dicks, Dingell, Dixon, Donnelly, Dornan, (CA), Durbin, Dwyer, (NJ), Dymally, Dyson, Early, Erdreich, Espy, Evans, Fascell, Fauntroy, Fawell, Fazio, Feighan, Flake, Flippo, Florio, Foglietta, Ford, (TN), Ford, (MI), Frank, Frenzel, Frost, Fuster, Garcia, Gonzalez, Guarini, Gaydos, Gephardt, Gilman, Goodling, Gordon, Gunderson, Gray, Hall, (OH), Hammerschmidt, Harris, Hastert, Hayes, (IL), Hayes, (LA), Hefner, Henry, Hertel, Hiler, Hoagland, Hochbrueckner, Horton, Hoyer, Hughes, Hutto, Jacobs, Jenkins, Johnson, (CT), Jones, (GA), Jones, (NC), Jontz, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kasich, Kennelly, Kildee, Kleczka, Kolter, Kostmayer, Lancaster, Lagomarsino, Lantos, Laughlin, Lehman, (CA), Leland, Levin, (MI), Levine, (CA), Lewis, (GA), Lipinski, Lukens, Donald E., McCloskey, McDade, McGrath, McHugh, Manton, Martin, (NY), Martin, (IL), Martinez, Matsui, Mavroules, McMillen, (MD), Meyers, (KS), Mfume, Miller, (CA), Mineta, Moakley, Mollohan, Moody, Morrison, (CT), Mrazek, Murphy, Murtha, Nagle, Neal, (MA), Nelson, (FL), Nowak, Oakar, Oberstar, Olin, Ortiz, Owens, (NY), Packard, Pallone, Pannetta, Parker, Paxon, Pelosi, Perkins, Pickett, Pickle, Porter, Rahall, Rangel, Richardson, Rinaldo, Roe, Rostenkowski, Rowland, (CT), Roybal, Russo, Sabo, Sangmeister, Savage, Sawyer, Scheuer, Schumer, Sharp, Sikorski, Sisisky, Skaggs, Skelton, Slaughter, (NY), Solarz, Smith, (FL), Staggers, Stallings, Stark, Stokes, Studds, Sundquist, Synar, Tallon, Thomas, (GA), Torricelli, Towns, Traficant, Traxler, Vander Jagt, Vento, Visclosky, Volkmer, Walgren, Walsh, Waxman, Weiss, Wilson, Wheat,

Wolfe, Wolpe, Wyden, Wylie, Yates, Yatron, Young, (AK), and Buechner.

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

[Mr. MCEWEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SKELTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A NOBEL PRIZE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, along with 10 cosponsors I am today introducing a resolution calling upon the Nobel Commission to consider awarding a Nobel prize for achievements in preservation of the world's environment.

The sorry condition of our global environment is a major concern for all peoples in the world today. Problems such as the greenhouse effect, ozone depletion, and oilspills, scream at us from the headlines of our daily newspapers. Some of these problems are confined to local regions of a single country; others affect nations as a whole. Most have profound international consequences. Oil spilled on the beaches of Alaska disturbs the food web throughout the Pacific Ocean. Radiation from an explosion at Chernobyl contaminates dairy products throughout northern Europe. Freon lost from a referigerator in Washington, DC, contributes to the loss of ozone in our atmosphere.

Awarding a Nobel prize would provide a fitting tribute to those who are working to help preserve our global environment. Such a prestigious award might also serve to motivate scientists, politicians, and individuals worldwide to devote more of their energies toward improving our understanding of, and sense of responsibility to, the environment.

The resolution I am introducing today is identical to that introduced in the Senate by Senator GORE. The idea of a Nobel prize for the environment emerged from a conference held by time magazine in 1988, prior to its decision to choose Earth as "Planet of the Year."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important resolution and to assist in its rapid passage through this body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), from July 11.

Mr. CHAPMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. MCDERMOTT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCEWEN, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUBBARD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUBBARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on July 10.

Mr. SWIFT, for 60 minutes, on July 18.

Mr. SWIFT, for 60 minutes, on July 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MARKEY, and include extraneous material preceding vote on Fascell en bloc amedment regarding China to H.R. 2655 in Committee on the Whole today.

Mr. RITTER, on en bloc amendments on H.R. 2655, in Committee of the Whole, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEFLEY.
Mr. SCHAEFER.
Mr. ROHRABACHER.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
Mr. MILLER of Washington.
Mr. HYDE in two instances.
Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. SCHUETTE.
Mr. GOSS.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. CRANE in two instances.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO in two instances.
Mr. GRANDY.
Mr. LOWERY of California.
Mr. SMITH of Mississippi.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. MCCANDLESS.
Mr. CRAIG.
Mr. COURTER.
Mr. PAXON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HUBBARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KANJORSKI in five instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.
Mr. LELAND in two instances.
Mr. SKELTON in two instances.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.
Mr. BONIOR in two instances.
Mr. TALLON in two instances.
Mr. BOUCHER.
Mr. BOGGS.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. RAHALL.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. RUSSO.
Mr. GLICKMAN in two instances.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. TOWNS.
Mr. KOSTMAYER.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. STALLINGS.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mrs. BYRON.
Mrs. BOXER.
Mr. HAYES of Illinois
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. DERRICK.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. BILBRAY.
Mr. CARR.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI in two instances.
Ms. PELOSI in two instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. SOLARZ.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2119. An act to authorize the exchange of certain Federal public land in Madison County, IL.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 694. An act to extend title I of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for

his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 28, 1989:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to designate the second Sunday in October of 1989 as "National Children's Day;"

H.J. Res. 276. Joint resolution designating September 14, 1989, as "National D.A.R.E. Day;"

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution designating July 14, 1989, as "National Day To Commemorate the Bastille Day Bicentennial;"

H.J. Res. 923. An act to redesignate the Federal hydropower generating facilities located at Dam B on the Neches River at Town Bluff, TX, as the "Robert Douglas Willis Hydropower Project;" and

H.J. Res. 2402. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1989, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 10, 1989

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUGHLIN). Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, 101st Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12 noon, Monday, July 10, 1989.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, the House adjourned until Monday, July 10, 1989, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1386. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of June 1, 1989, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 101-77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1387 A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original reports of political contributions by Luigi R. Einaudi, the Permanent Representative-designate to the OAS; by Warren A. Lavorel, United States Coordinator-designate for Multilateral Trade Negotiations; and by Richard W. Boehm, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to the Sultanate of Oman, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 987. A bill to amend the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, to designate certain lands in the Tongass National Forest as wilderness, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 101-84, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORD of Michigan: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Rept. 101-117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. PCB's: EPA must strengthen regulations, improve enforcement and prevent criminal activity (Rept. 101-118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YATES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2788. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1990, and for other purposes (Rept. 101-120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1668. A bill to authorize appropriations for certain ocean and coastal programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; with an amendment; referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs; Interior and Insular Affairs; Public Works and Transportation; and Science, Space and Technology for a period ending not later than August 4, 1989, for consideration of such provisions of the amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to clause 1 (i), (l), (p), and (r), rule X, respectively (Rept. 101-119, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2789. A bill to establish an employment program to make grants available to the States to provide employment to physically and mentally impaired individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida);

H.R. 2790. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study certain lands for potential inclusion in the National Park System, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, or the National Forest System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Agriculture.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to encourage the remining and reclamation of abandoned mined lands by active mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRENNAN:

H.R. 2792. A bill to authorize appropriations to reimburse State and local police and sheriff's departments in the State of Maine for certain security-related expenses arising out of visits by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2793. A bill to establish a hydrogen research and development program; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 2794. A bill to make technical corrections and other miscellaneous amendments to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. HAMILTON):

H.R. 2795. A bill to modernize the Federal Reserve System and to provide for prompt disclosure of certain decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Colorado):

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of interest income and rental expense in connection with safe harbor leases involving rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN of California:

H.R. 2797. A bill to impose an embargo on trade with Syria; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means; Foreign Affairs; and Banking Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DORNAN of California (for himself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2798. A bill to establish a Police Corps Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to allow the planting of alternate crops on permitted acreage for the 1990 crop year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HUBBARD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend title 10 and 14, United States Code, to permit recordings of military bands to be sold commercially; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SWIFT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.R. 2801. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security act to permit a State to exclude from coverage (by a modification or additional modification of the applicable State agreement under section 218 of that act) any service performed by election officials or election workers in cases where the remuneration paid for such service is less than $100 in a calendar quarter of $300 in a calendar year (rather than only where such

remuneration is less than $100 in a calendar year as presently permitted); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan:

H.R. 2802. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, and associated provisions of other laws, to make technical and perfecting corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HENRY, AND MR. SMITH of Vermont):

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to improve the delivery of services to hard-to-serve youth and adults, to establish the Youth Opportunities Unlimited Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. OLIN, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. ESPY):

H.R. 2804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend for 3 years the exemption from the termination of small issue bonds for farm property and manufacturing facilities located in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN:

H.R. 2805. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that persons comply with State and local firearms licensing laws before receiving a Federal license to deal in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi):

H.R. 2806. A bill to amend section 511 of the Controlled Substances Act to make technical, clarifying, and administrative amendments, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 2807. A bill to provide for the establishment of a memorial on Federal land within the District of Columbia to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II, and to express the sense of Congress concerning U.S. participation in that conflict; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2808. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require schools to test for radon contamination; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN of California:

H.R. 2809. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.R. 2810. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to require the United States Postal Service to make space available in post offices for State voter registration authorities to place voter registration forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 2811. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service give voter registration forms along with change-of-address forms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish a pay schedule, to revise the rates of pay for Federal Fire Service personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 2813. A bill to improve the information available to emergency response personnel in the field, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 2814. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize transportation on military aircraft to be provided to former members of the Armed Forces who are totally disabled as the result of a service-connected disability in the same manner and to the same extent as such transportation is provided to retired members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2815. A bill to provide military commissary and exchange privileges to the surviving spouses of veterans dying from a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2816. A bill to authorize the award of the Purple Heart to former prisoners of war of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war for injuries received during captivity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the formula for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] to the surviving spouses of veterans who die on active duty or from service-connected disaiblities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2818. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend from 1 year to 3 years the period after separation from service during which the conditions of Hodgkin's disease and leukemia occurring in a veteran shall be presumed to be service-connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2819. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend from 1 year to 2 years the period during which veterans with service-connected disabilities may apply for national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2820. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend educational assistance benefits to dependents of veterans with a service-connected disability of 80 percent or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2821. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain additional protection from reduction for the disability ratings of veterans with service-connected disabilities rated total for not less than 10 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2822. A bill to amend chapter 42 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of disabled veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that recipients of the Purple Heart award be considered compensably disabled veterans for purpose of veterans' preference in Federal civil service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2824. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that a chronic disease becoming manifest in a veteran within 1 year of the veteran's discharge from military service must be at least 10 percent disabling in order to be presumed to be service connected for purposes of veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2825. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that former prisoners of war are eligible for reimbursement for emergency medical expenses on the same basis as veterans with total permanent service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain eligible veterans to purchase up to $20,000 of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the implementation of section 2014 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend from 60 days to 120 days the period between notice and effective date for certain reductions and discontinuations of Department of Veterans Affairs monetary benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2829. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the standard for preservation of disability evaluations for compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an increase in the amount of dependency and indemnity compensation paid to dependent parents of deceased veterans in the case of parents who are permanently housebound; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2831. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make direct low-interest loans to veterans eligible for specially adapted housing assistance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide mortgage protection life insurance to certain veterans unable to acquire commercial mortgage protection life insurance because of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2833. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the delimiting date for spouses and surviving spouses eligible for benefits under chapter 35; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 2834. A bill to enhance the operation of the Steel Import Stabilization Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2835. A bill to provide for the relocation of certain facilities at the Gateway National Recreation Area, Sandy Hook, NJ, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2836. A bill to postpone the effective date of certain financial syndication rules of the Federal Communications Commission pending the outcome of litigation concerning the legal authority for such rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ROBINSON):

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend chapter 34 of such title for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself and Mr. LEWIS of Florida):

H.R. 2838. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded the Seminole Indians in dockets 73, 151, and 73-A of the Indian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Vermont:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clearly express the fact that appointed judges are protected under such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 2840. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2841. A bill to authorize the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 2842. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975 through fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. KOLBE):

H.R. 2843. A bill to establish the Kino Missions National Monument in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 2844. A bill to improve the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to properly manage certain resources of the National Park System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER):

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to promote recycling and other resource conservation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EARLY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HAYES of Illinios, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HILER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PAXON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TALLON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATES, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BUECHNER):

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution to designate October 1989 as "Polish American Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BEVILL):

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution designating September 15, 1989, as "National Telephone Operators Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution to commend the President's decision to grant temporary refuge to Chinese intellectuals and human rights activists Fang Lizhi and Li Shuxian; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BATES, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN):

H. Res. 193. Resolution to urge the Nobel Commission to consider awarding Nobel Prize recognition for achievements in preservation of the world environment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. STENHOLM introduced a bill (H.R. 2846) for the relief of Elizabeth M. Hill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 13: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 47: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS.

H.R. 118: Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 160: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 237: Mr. MATSUI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DYMALLY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 488: Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 500: Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 526: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 557: Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.R. 570: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 598: Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 634: Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 642: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 671: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 672: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 683: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 725: Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 844: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 860: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 864: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York and Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.R. 929: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROE, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 931: Mr. GILMAN and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 966: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1036: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1056: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COURTER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1087: Mr. PRICE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1100: Mr. BUECHNER.

H.R. 1193: Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 1236: Mr. WISE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1356: Mr. UDALL, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. SAIKI, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1465: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1532: Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1574: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1652: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1675: Mr. YOUNG of Florida and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 1725: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1804: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WISE, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 1811: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1854: Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1860: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2022: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 2037, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RAY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. WISE, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TALLON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 2050: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2121: Mr. COYNE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2138: Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2144: Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 2168: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 2174: Mrs. BOGGS and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2190: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MCCURDY.

H.R. 2209: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 2216: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 2222: Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2223: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2228: Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 2265: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 2274: Mr. HORTON, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 2283: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 2294: Mr. PENNY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2302: Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2303: Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 2351: Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ECKART, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2353: Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 2360: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2380: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 2388: Mr. WALSH, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 2418: Mr. HILER and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 2493: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 2525: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 2543: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 2547: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2549: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 2561: Mr. WALSH, Mr. COURTER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 2584: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2596: Mr. WEISS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BATES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 2614: Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 2615: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2665: Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SABO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 2674: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 2681: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2682: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 2687: Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 2699: Mr. ROYBAL and Mr. DOUGLAS.

H.R. 2700: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 2712: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. SMITH of Vermont.

H.R. 2718: Mr. FORD of Michigan and, Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 2732: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois and Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.R. 2770: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 2787: Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 54: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. MFUME.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PAYNE, of New Jersey, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. TALLON.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. DYSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. AUCOIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.J. Res. 160: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.J. Res. 163: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CONTE, Mr. RINALDO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. CARR, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 178: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COX, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MADIGAN, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 212: Mr. COX.

H.J. Res. 221: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 257: Mr. WALGREN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 260: Mr. ASPIN.

H.J. Res. 265: Mr. MICHEL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BATES, Mr. VENTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STARK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. UPTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ESPY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARTIN of New York, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.J. Res. 275: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LELAND, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. OLIN.

H.J. Res. 278: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. MINETA.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.J. Res. 289: Mr. HORTON, Mr. OLIN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Ms. Pelosi, and Mr. HAWKINS.

H.J. Res. 290: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.J. Res. 292: Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WEISS, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 293: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PARRIS, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.J. Res. 303: Mr. PAXON, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. HERGER.

H.J. Res. 305: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 314: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUCKABY, and Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.J. Res. 318: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 321: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. BATES.

H.J. Res. 325: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 329: Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 330: Mr. BUNNING, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. RAY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. BROWDER.

H.J. Res. 331: Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 335: Mr. WYLIE and Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 336: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. HOLLOWAY.

H.J. Res. 337: Mr. COURTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HUTTO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. RITTER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. DICKINSON.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. PALLONE.

H. Con. Res. 134: Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Res. 172: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 176: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H. Res. 184: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Res. 185: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. COX, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Res. 188: Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 189: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. WYLIE.

H. Res. 191: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARKING THE BIRTHDAY OF INVENTOR NIKOLA TESLA

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, July 10 marks the 133d anniversary of the birth of Nikola Tesla, a native of Yugoslavia who traveled to this country in 1884 and discovered the rotating magnetic field, considered the basis of most alternating-current machinery.

Tesla's vision and achievements earn him a stature the world has eagerly bestowed on Thomas Edison and George Westinghouse, two of his contemporaries. Yet he remains relatively unknown despite the fact his research did much to create the world we live in today.

Tesla was no stranger to my hometown of Colorado Springs. Along one side of Prospect Park there's a plaque marking the place where, in 1899 and 1900, Tesla conducted some of his most spectacular experiments. Those experiments were recounted by author Harry L. Goldman in the March 1971 edition of the American West: The Magazine of Western History. I commend that article to my colleagues for their attention.

[From the American West: The Magazine of Western History, March 1971]

NIKOLA TESLA'S BOLD ADVENTURE

(By Harry L. Goldman)

On the afternoon of May 17, 1899, inventor Nikola Tesla stepped from the train at Colorado Springs obsessed with electrifying the earth. The elite of Little London turned out to welcome the stranger from New York City and they were not disappointed—Tesla was a striking figure. His tall slenderness, wavy black hair, piercing gray eyes, and European mannerisms never failed to capture the emotions of those about him.

Of the several dignitaries who made it their business to be on hand, few were able to comprehend the significance of Tesla's visit. It was not long before the electrical wizard was able to give his audience a traumatic demonstration of his purpose.

Of the thousands who reached these shores in 1884, destiny marked Nikola Tesla, an immigrant from Yugoslavia, as one who would soon stand out from the crowd. Within a span of fifteen years, the ambitious inventor bestowed upon his adopted country a prodigious number of scientific achievements and accomplishments.

He not only gave us our present system of alternating-current power transmission, but also the invaluable a.c. motor, ideas and apparatus for industrial induction heating and welding, diathermy, with its medical applications, synchronous time mechanisms, gaseous tube lighting as in neon and fluorescent bulbs, as well as X-ray apparatus and techniques for their employment. Furthermore, Tesla established a considerable amount of the groundwork for radio communications and related fields including the science of radio-guided missiles.

At the turn of the century, when colleagues were directing their attention to moderate distance code communications, Tesla was feverishly anticipating a method of broadcasting music, speech, pictures, and newspapers to all parts of the globe. According to the inventor, his "World System" of communications would not only interconnect telegraph, telephone, and stock ticker services, but would also provide the benefits of safe and accurate navigation without the aid of compasses. Clocks throughout the world would require little attention as their operation could be radio-controlled from a master station. In addition, he claimed that it would provide personal telephone communications between parties, regardless of distance, with an incredible device small enough to be carried in one's pocket.

As though this were not enough, Tesla's World System was to incorporate the transmission of electric power without the aid of wires. Swaggering in his own inimitable manner of grandeur, the inventor predicted the feasibility of running the street cars of London and lighting the lamps of Paris by the power generated from Niagara. The implications of such a reality fermented a passion which bordered on the threshold of physical pain. "Humanity will be like an ant heap stirred up with a stick," cried the impetuous Tesla. "See the excitement coming!"

Tesla's New York experiments had become restricted by the physical limitations of his Houston Street laboratory. The four-million volt lightning-like discharges produced by his electrical transformers struck ceilings and walls. It was impossible for him to apply practical tests to his wireless transmission theory without accommodations more in proportion to the enormity of his imagination.

Evidently, Tesla's fame and stories of his scientific achievements had preceded him in his journey to the West. His arrival created quite a stir in that bustling community known "for its cosmopolite and high bred people" as well as "its reputation of always doing the right thing at the right time." Noting Tesla's arrival, the Colorado Springs *Gazette* (May 28) declared. "This week has been noticeable for the presence of distinguished personages in Colorado Springs. Tesla, the electrician, second only to Edison, if indeed to anyone, is establishing his scientific headquarters here and will settle the question of wireless telegraphy in the weeks to come." News reporters badgered the inventor with questions about his scientific achievements and for information pertinent to his presence in Colorado Springs.

Tesla satisfied their curiosity by informing them that he proposed "to send a message from Pike's Peak to Paris." (This was more than two years prior to Marconi's famed transatlantic transmission.) The natives were well aware of a United States Signal Service (Weather Bureau) telegraph station at the summit of their famous mountain but Tesla's utterances were something else. The inventor further explained, "I will investigate electrical disturbances in the earth. There are great laws, which I want to discover, and principles to command."

Tesla took a room at the Alta Vista Hotel with a view of the majestic Peak, affording him an opportunity for enjoying his favorite pastime, watching nature's lofty thunderbolts. Furthermore, he liked Room 207 because its number was divisible by three. Tesla's habit of carrying out experiments and repeated acts in numbers divisible by three was but one of the many phobias that haunted the inventor throughout his life.

Armed with a loan of $30,000 from John Jacob Astor, $10,000 from M. Crawford, a drygoods merchant, and the unending influence of his lawyer friend, Leonard E. Curtis. Tesla became fervently committed to a regimented schedule. He contracted for the construction of an experimental laboratory of his own design. In mid-July, a structure of awe and mystery stood isolated on the prairie pasture east of the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind. It was a huge barn-like construction approximately 100 feet square and braced on three sides. Above its sloping roof was an 80-foot tower through which there extended a 200-foot mast topped by a one-meter copper sphere. The forbidding omen hovering over the area was augmented by a fence with notices written in large black letters warning, "Keep Out—Great Danger!"

The major part of the interior was taken up with a variety of Tesla innovations. The electrical wizard was pioneering virgin fields and his apparatus, yet untried and exhibiting all the characteristics peculiar to an H.G. Wells's fantasy, had to be constructed by highly trained technicians and shipped from the east. High-voltage transformers, dynamos, resonant-tuning devices, capacitor-discharge apparatus, oil-insulated capacitors (a Tesla invention), and a large metered control panel were among the items neatly spaced about the hall.

At one end of the laboratory was the secondary coil of a giant Tesla transformer, which the inventor termed a "magnifying transmitter." Its primary coil (buried underneath the floor) was fifty-one feet in diameter and wound with heavy copper bars.

In the center of the secondary was another coil with a diameter of ten feet. It carried 100 turns of wire and served to function as an extension of the secondary. The 200-foot mast extended up through the center and supported a large copper cable, which connected to the one-meter copper sphere. Using these devices, Tesla intended to determine if the earth possessed an electrical charge (it does) and to institute experiments that would alter its magnitude (he did). Who but Tesla would be so bold as to undertake a scientific investigation of such proportions?

The mystified citizens of Colorado Springs kept a safe distance from the odd-looking structure. Passersby, such as those using the trolley line on Nob Hill, were amazed by its precocious appearance and would stare in unison with similar sorts of ungainly expressons. Herdsmen moving their animals out to pasture went about their work unable to conceal their contemplations.

Those whose curiosity led them to trespass the bounds of the property reported seeing strange blue flickering lights emanat-

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ing from the enigmatic gadgets within the laboratory. Said one eyewitness, "Through this mass of intricate and dangerous mechanism, Mr. Tesla walks as fearlessly as if on the streets of the city." A reporter who had managed a peek through the windows was startled to find a Tesla employee standing at his side. "Your life is in peril," he said, "and you would be a great deal safer if you would remove yourself from the vicinity." Tesla was extremely secretive about his work and always maintained a strict security. In order to discourage the overly curious, he publicly announced, "I have an instrument at my station which is capable of killing thirty thousand people in an instant."

There were, however, a few residents who were allowed the privilege of infringing upon the sancity of Telsa's Olympus. In the book, *The Life of Nikola Tesla*, authors Hunt and Draper mention Fred Stevens, a photographer, and Richard Gregg, an errand boy.

Nonetheless, it is doubtful whether anyone on either side of the Missisippi ever viewed a creation similar to the likes of Tesla's experimental station, and it is no wonder that the sight prompted one writer to say, "Mr. Tesla is a great scientist but a poor architect."

By mid-summer of 1899, Tesla was able to utilize his Colorado experimental station for preliminary investigations of his wireless telegraphy theories. He was extremely pleased with this western state as the site for his experiments. Aside from the pleasantness of its natural beauty, the rarefied air provided exceptional opportunities for the study of high potential electrical phenomena. "No better opportunities for such observations as I intended to make could be found anywhere," said Tesla. "Colorado is a country famous for the natural displays of electric force. In that dry and rarefield atmosphere the sun's rays heat the objects with fierce intensity. I raised steam to a dangerous pressure, in barrels filled with concentrated salt solution, and the tin-foil coatings of some of my elevated terminals shriveled up in the fiery blaze.

"An experimental high-tension transformer, carelessly exposed to the rays of the setting sun, had most of its insulating compound melted out and was rendered useless. Aided by the dryness and rarefaction of the air, the water evaporates as in a boiler, and static electricity is developed in abundance.

"Lightning discharges are, accordingly, very frequent and sometimes of inconceivable violence. On one occasion approximately twelve thousand discharges occurred in two hours, and all in a radius of certainly less than fifty kilometers from the laboratory. Many of them resembled gigantic trees of fire with the trunks up or down. I never saw fire balls, but as a compensation for my disappointment, I succeeded later in determining the mode of their formation and producing them artificially."

On one occasion, a fierce lightning bolt nearly demolished Tesla's station even though the actual strike occurred at a great distance. Reported Tesla, "A heavy cloud had gathered over Pike's Peak range and suddenly lightning struck at a point just ten miles away. I timed the flash instantly and, upon making a quick computation, told my assistants that the tidal wave would arrive in 48.5 seconds.

"Exactly with the lapse of this time interval a terrific blow struck the building, which might have been thrown off the foundation had it not been strongly braced. All the windows on one side and a door were demolished and much damage done in the interior. Taking into account the energy of the electric discharge and its duration, as well as that of an explosion, I estimated that the concussion was about the equivalent to the ignition of twelve tons of dynamite."

It was during a violent Colorado electrical storm that Tesla came to make one of his most astounding scientific discoveries. After carefully adjusting his delicate measuring instruments, the inventor noted an unusual reaction to the earth's electrical activity. "No doubt whatever remained," said Tesla. "I was observing stationary (standing) waves. . . Impossible as it seemed, this planet, despite its vast extent behaved like a conductor of limited dimensions. The tremendous significance of this fact in the transmission of energy by my system had already become quite clear to me. Not only was it practicable to send telegraphic messages to any distance without wires, as I recognized long ago, but also to impress upon the entire globe the faint modulations of the human voice, far more still, to transmit power, in unlimited amounts to any terrestrial distance and almost without loss."

Tesla later suggested the employment of standing waves as a means of detecting moving objects at great distances. "By their use . . . we may determine the relative position or course of moving object, such as a vessel at sea, the distance traversed by the same, or its speed." It wasn't until just before World War II, some forty-one years later, that radar—as foretold by Tesla—became a reality.

As a result of his investigations, Tesla concluded that the earth was not only electrified, but that it was charged to an extreme potential. Accordingly, if it were possible to increase the magnitude of the earth's electric charge by artificial means, it might also be possible to withdraw the applied energy anywhere on the globe. Basically, this meant that Tesla's "system" was to provide the benefits of electricity not only to the highly populated continents, but even to the most remote civilized outposts whether on land or at sea.

To accomplish this, however, would require the development of transmitting and receiving apparatus unlike any devices heretofore conceived. It was to this purpose that the electrical wizard dedicated his tireless efforts. At the end of the summer of 1899, the equipment stood ready, in statuelike silence, awaiting the highest man-made voltage experiment in history. Tesla was about to cross a new frontier—one far beyond that which anyone else had reached.

During the initial test, the mute electrical machinery suddenly transformed into lifelike fire-spitting demons. Power transformers supplying the heavy currents hummed a dissonant sixty-cycle tune. The floor beams vibrated a cacophonic reply. Spheres of the capacitor-discharge circuit became bridged by a machine-gun series of wrist-thick blinding flashes. The huge secondary of Tesla's transformer was crowned by an electrical fire of long finger-like streamers. A halo of harassing brush discharges enveloped the entire surface of the main switch panel.

Evidently, stray high-frequency currents had found a return path into the Colorado Springs Electric Company's facilities. Unknown to Tesla, the reaction was playing havoc with their generators and transmission lines. Lightning insulators within a dozen miles became short-circuited and glowed with purplish arcs.

The awesome discharges, thundering roar, and the production of choking quantities of pungent ozone portrayed an impression of impending doom. Waving his arms wildly, Tesla screamed an abrupt order to assistants to halt the experiment. Pandemonium gave way to a frightening silence.

Following an inspection of the apparatus and the making of critical adjustments, the inventor issued instructions for a continuation of the test. This time, however, he would take a position outside from where he could observe the copper sphere high above the roof. Standing alone some three hundred feet from the building, the wizard signaled a resumption of the experiment. He presented a bewildering sight. His inch-thick rubber heels, tight fitting cutaway coat, and black derby hat made him appear to be seven feet tall.

As before, the high-voltage equipment gave an immediate response. Full-fledged lightning bolts over 135 feet in length erupted from the copper sphere. Leaping about in unpredictable fashion, one leader followed the mast downward into the laboratory; another hit the 80-foot framework which was giving support to the 200-foot pole, while others were seen as wriggling streaks clawing at the sky above.

Nearby, in the village of Colorado Springs, the natives, could hardly ignore the electircal wizard's scientific mischief. The thundering roar of his man-made lightning bolts could be heard as far away as Cripple Creek. People walking along the streets experienced the unpleasantness of sparks jumping between their feet and the ground. An electrical flame leaped from a tap when anyone reached for a drink of water.

So great was the power being thrown out by Tesla's "magnifying transmitter" that lights bulbs within one hundred feet of the station glowed regardless of whether they were connected to any circuit and all the electrical equipment of a nearby fuel company ceased to function.

When Tesla's experiments utilized undamped waves (no streamers emitting from the copper sphere), horses at the livery stable suddenly bolted and kicked free of their stalls. Even the insects felt the effects of the electrical barrage. Butterfiles became electrified and helplessly swirled in circles—their wings spouting blue halos of "St. Elmo's Fire." One graphic account about the destruction of the main generator at the Colorado Springs Electric Company powerhouse.

Aside from what has been mentioned, little is known of the technical achievements of Tesla's Colorado adventure. The inventor claimed to have demonstrated the practical application of his theory in an experiment which lighted two hundred earth-connected incandescent lamps twenty-six miles from the laboratory. Unfortunately, no photographic record of this event has ever been published and there has been no indication as to the location of the receiving station.

Encouraged by the fruits of his labors, Tesla left Colorado on January 13, 1900, and returned to New York with plans for establishing a world radio broadcasting station (this was two decades prior to the advent of world communications). He obtained $150,000 from J.P. Morgan and began construction of a plant at Shoreham, Long Island. It consisted of a brick building to house the transmitting equipment and a massive 187-foot octagonal tower capped by a sixty-eight foot metal-framed dome weighing nearly sixty tons.

The plant was never put into operation. Construction problems proved more costly

than had been anticipated. And when rumors began circulating debasing the project as a fairy tale, Wall Street turned its back on Tesla's enterprise, a stroke that defeated one of the most unbelievable schemes in the history of human advancement.

Tesla's Colorado station came to an equally inglorious end. It remained intact for several years but eventually was torn down and its contents sold as payment in a suit for unpaid bills and employees' wages. Few references to Colorado history mention its existence and the omission makes it appear as though Tesla's bold adventure was nothing more than a passing dream.

THE AMERICAN FLAG BELONGS TO ALL AMERICANS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I was sorely distressed when the Supreme Court struck down the Texas law which said it was a crime to burn an American flag. This Court opinion extended the freedom of speech clause of the first amendment far beyond the intent of the authors of our Bill of Rights.

Millions of men and women have served our country under the Stars and Stripes, and hundreds of thousands have made the supreme sacrifice under its colors.

The sight of our flag rippling in the wind has served as encouragement and a symbol of freedom throughout the world. Were the U.S. Capitol to be defaced or the statue of George Washington to be damaged, that crime certainly would have been upheld. The American flag belongs to all of us, just like our Nation's Capitol and the statue of our first President. Thus, a constitutional amendment to change this ruling is in order, and I support such an amendment allowing a law to stand that makes it a crime to desecrate Old Glory.

THE POSTAL SERVICE VOTER REGISTRATION FACILITATION ACTS OF 1989

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills which shall comprise the Postal Service Voter Registration Facilitation Acts of 1989, to expand the role of the Federal Government in efforts to increase voter registration, and therefore, voter turnout. The first bill provides that the U.S. Postal Service shall make available space at post offices for State voter registration authorities to place voter registration forms for the public. The second bill provides that a voter registration form be given to each postal patron to whom a change-of-address form is given.

The United States chronically experiences one of the lowest records of voter participation among the industrialized countries. The national voter turnout has been steadily declining since 1964, in both Presidential and non-Presidental election years. In 1986, a non-Presidential election year, 36.41 percent of the national voting age population voted. In 1988, a Presidential election year, 50.15 percent of the national voting age population voted. These figures are distressing. It is important to consider that we live in a democracy, wherby, the American population is represented by the people votes. If half, and sometimes more than half of the people do not vote, then the meaning of our mandate is called into question.

A valid argument, frequently used, is that some people, by not voting, exercise their right to free choice. In order for this argument to be meaningful, every individual, who does not vote, must at least be registered. This would clarify whether these people are in fact choosing not to vote, or whether they are simply unable to register. The fact is that voter registration has remained steady at about 70 percent of the voting age population. This percentage is unsatisfactory. The Federal Government must pursue this problem and implement measures which strive to achieve voter registration as close to 100 percent as possible.

Voter registration should be facilitated in order to insure that each and every individual of voting age has a reasonable opportunity to register. This can be accomplished effectively by making voter registration forms available at U.S. Post Offices, which can be found in every town and corner of our great Nation. There are between 30,000 and 40,000 post offices in the United States. The public could easily locate the post office which is in his or her area.

A second reason for establishing the post office as a location for voter registration forms, is consistency. Much of the confusion and frustration, which some people may experience can be resolved by informing everyone that the forms may be obtained at the post office. Campaigning to increase voter registration must be undertaken on a national level.

The Federal Government must undertake a more active role in facilitating voter registration. It is the responsibility of the National Government to protect and uphold democracy. Significant voter turnout is a fundamental aspect of an effective, and legitimate democracy. The desire for high voter participation should be a long-term bipartisan effort. We must strive to cure the illness, apathy, which has plagued our Nation for far too long.

DISGUST WITH THE HIGH COURT'S RULING

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, while many of us have spoken at great length about our outrage at the decision reached by the Supreme Court to allow our flag to be burned, we are now just beginning to hear from the people we represent. Our constituents feel the same outrage. I would like to share with my colleagues a radio editorial which was recently aired by Alamogordo, NM, radio station KPSA. I fully concur with KPSA President Bob Flottee and his disgust with the High Court's ruling.

The editorial follows:

In a recent decision the Supreme Court ruled five to four to limit the States power to outlaw the desecration of the American flag. In doing so they threw out the conviction of a man who burned a flag during a demonstration at the 1984 Republican National Convention. The burning of our American flag is now a constitutionally protected form of expression. One has to wonder if the authors of our Constitution really intended to protect the rights of freedom of expression for those who would publicly desecrate such an honored symbol of our freedom and national unity. We believe that the authors of our Constitution would be disgusted by the recent Supreme Court decision. However, the Supreme Court has ruled that the Constitution does indeed guarantee such freedoms. We can, however, take solace in the fact that we live in a country where even those who take part in such a public display, need not fear reprisals from armed troops and tanks. Our system of government is one of the greatest experiments of all time. Never before has a democratic form of government been tempered with such concern for the right of the individual. While there are many decisions that we do not agree with, it must be remembered that in this country the rights of the individual are respected and protected. America is still the greatest country in the world and I couldn't image living anywhere else. If you wish to accuse que-pasa radio of flag waving, that is fine. Because at que-pasa we wave the American flag with pride.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE REFORM ACT OF 1989

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I and Congressman HAMILTON are introducing legislation to begin democratizing the process by which monetary policy is made in our country. This legislation will make monetary policy more responsive to the interests of the American people.

The Federal Reserve Board develops this country's monetary policy. Decisions by the Fed have a significant impact on every farmhouse, business, and family in America. Interest rates rise and fall with the Fed's decisions—inflation, productivity, and economic growth, are all heavily influenced by the actions of the Federal Reserve Board.

While the Fed's influence is immense, its responsiveness to the public is minimal. The architects of our Government's fiscal policy—the administration and Congress—have no direct impact on, or even knowledge of, the decisions made by the Fed. As a result, coordination of our fiscal and monetary policies is usually only accidental.

The lawmakers who wrote the original Federal Reserve Act of 1913 tried to ensure that the Fed would never become what, in fact, it has become—a powerful, central bank accountable to no one.

Our democracy is supposed to be governed by the will of the people. It's time to make some changes so that our monetary policy works within that democratic framework. The Fed must be made more responsive to those it is supposed to serve, and not be allowed to continue in its cloak of secrecy. The Fed's constituency should be all Americans and not just big banks.

The Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1989 moves in the direction of democratizing the Fed by taking the following steps:

First. The Secretary of the Treasury would become a voting member of the Federal Open Market Committee.

Second. The term of the Fed's chairman would parallel that of the President.

Third. The General Accounting Office would be required to conduct an annual financial audit of the Federal Reserve System.

Fourth. It would require the Federal Reserve's budget to be published in the budget of the U.S. Government, for the current year and 2 succeeding years.

Fifth. Monetary policy decisions would be announced on the day they are made.

These are modest steps in trying to open up the process to make the Federal Reserve Board a meaningful player in our democratic system. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1989.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reserve Reform Act of 1989".

SEC. 2. PLACING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON THE FOMC.

The first sentence of section 12A(a) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 263(a)) is amended by inserting ", the Secretary of the Treasury," after "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System".

SEC. 3. APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The second paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 242) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one member of the Board to serve as Chairman. The term of such member as Chairman shall expire on January 31 of the first calendar year beginning after the end of the term of the President who appointed such member as Chairman. If a member appointed as Chairman does not complete the term of such office as established in the preceding sentence, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, another member to complete the unexpired portion of such term. The President shall also appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one member of the Board to serve as Vice Chairman for a term of four years. The Chairman and the Vice Chairman may each serve after the end of their respective terms until a successor has taken office.".

(b) PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES.—The second paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 242) is amended by inserting the following new sentences before the sentence which prior to the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section was the fourth sentence of such paragraph: "In the event of the absence or unavailability of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman or (in the Vice Chairman's absence) another member of the Board may be designated by the Chairman to perform the duties of the office of the Chairman. If a vacancy occurs in the office of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman shall perform the duties of the Chairman until a successor takes office. If a vacancy occurs in the office of the Vice Chairman while the office of the Chairman is vacant, the member of the Board with the most years of service on the Board shall perform the duties of the Chairman until a successor takes office.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CURRENT CHAIRMAN TO COMPLETE TERM.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection

(a), any member who holds the office of Chairman on the date of the enactment of this Act shall continue in such office during the remainder of the term to which such member was appointed.

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERMEDIATE TARGETS.

Section 12A(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 263(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each change, of any nature whatsoever, in the intermediate targets for monetary policy which is adopted by the Committee shall be disclosed to the public on the date on which such changes is adopted. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'intermediate targets' means any policy objectives regarding monetary aggregates, credit aggregates, prices, interest rates, or bank reserves.".

SEC. 5. AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code (relating to audits by the Comptroller General) is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking out paragraphs (2) and (3); and

(3) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

"(2) memoranda, letters, or other written communications between or among members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or officers or employees of the Federal Reserve System relating to any transaction described in paragraph (1).".

SEC. 6. BOARD SUBJECT TO BUDGET PROCESS.

Section 1105 of title 31, United States Code (relating to budget contents and submission to Congress) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD BUDGET TREATMENT.—Estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and all Federal Reserve Banks for the current year and the 2 succeeding years to be included in each budget under subsection (a)(5) and estimated under subsection (a)(6) shall be submitted to the President before October 16 of each year and included in the budget by the President without change.".

WARDS COVE PACKING CO. VERSUS ATONIO—STATISTICS SPEAK, BUT THE COURT NO LONGER LISTENS

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1989, the Supreme Court took three giant steps backwards in the battle against race discrimination in employment. Wards Cove Packing Company versus Frank Atonio. Chief Justice Rehnquist—elevated by President Reagan—Justices O'Connor, Scalia, and Kennedy—appointed by President Reagan—joined an opinion delivered by Justice White holding that when Alaska salmon canneries hired Eskimo and Filipino workers for low paying cannery jobs on the cannery lines, and white employees for the higher paying noncannery jobs—some skilled, and some not skilled and then assigned the white and non-white workers to segregated dormitories and mess halls, there was no violation of the law, not even a violation of the goals of the Civil Rights Act we enacted in 1964. The Reagan struggle to pack the court with conservative ideologues is finally manifest.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act makes it an unfair employment practice for an employer or a union to discriminate against any individual with respect to employment conditions because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. It also prohibits the segregation or classification of employees or applicants for employment in anyway which might affect their status as employees. Stratification by race, color, and national origin, as in the salmon cannery case, seems well within these prohibitions.

The bare bones of our statute were fleshed out by the 1971 Griggs versus Duke Power Co. decision written by then-Chief Justice Burger for a unanimous Court. The facts there were straightforward, and much like those in the salmon cannery case.

Prior to our 1964 law, the Duke Power Co. segregated its labor force: Laborers were black, all better paid positions were reserved for whites. After our 1964 law became effective, the Duke Power Co. adopted a requirement that all employees above the rank of laborer must have a high school diploma or score well on a standardized test. The impact fell heavily upon the blacks, disparately so. At that time in North Carolina, 34 percent of white males had completed high school, but only 12 percent of black males had done so.

Black laborers at the power company were denied promotion to a coal haulers position for lack of a high school diploma. They sued, alleging employment discrimination. They lost in the lower courts because they failed to prove an intent to discriminate. The Supreme Court reversed. Its landmark decision stressed that the object of our 1964 Act was to "remove built-in headwinds for minority groups that are unrelated to measuring job capability." Chief Justcie Burger went on to hold that when, as in the salmon cannery case, statistics disclose a racial disparity, the employer's

intent is of no consequence because, under the Act:

Practices, procedures, or tests neutral on their face, and even neutral in terms of intent, cannot be maintained if they operate to freeze the status quo of prior disciminatory employment practices.

Thus, when statistics indicate that a given employment practice, such as the requirement for a high school diploma, has a disparate impact on an identifiable group of employees, the employer must prove that the requirement is job related. As Chief Justice Burger wrote:

Congress has placed on the employer a burden of showing that any given requirement must have a manifest relationship to the employment in question.

In short, tests must measure the person for the job, not the person in the abstract.

The burden we and the courts have imposed on the employer is a heavy one and, even if met, will not carry the day if the employees then can demonstrate that "other tests or selection devices, without a similar undesirable racial effect, would also serve the employer's legitimate hiring interests." *Albermarle Paper Co.* v. *Moody,* 422 U.S. 405 (1975).

Such was the law of "disparate impact" until this week's decision in the salmon cannery case by the Reagan appointees, which Justice Stevens called their "latest sojourn into judicial activism."

Salmon canneries are located in remote, sparsely populated areas of Alaska. The work is seasonal and intense. The employers recruit workers for the unskilled cannery line jobs from nearby native villages, and through a hiring hall agreement with a union composed largely of Filipino workers. The union dispatches the workers to Alaska.

For the noncannery positions, the companies in Portland and Seattle rely on informal word-of-mouth recruitment by predominantly white superintendents and foremen. Coupled with nepotistic hiring, the discriminatory impact is obvious. Nepotism is giving preference to relatives, and where those doing the hiring are white, the practice necessarily has an adverse impact on nonwhites.

The cannery line nonwhite employees who filed the suit in this case alleged that the racial stratification which permeated the cannery camps in Alaska resulted from a combination of a variety of employment practices: Nepotism, a rehire preference, a refusal to promote from within, separate hiring channels, and so on. They prevailed in the court of appeals, but not in the Supreme Court.

That Court held that the glaring imbalance among the cannery line employees and those who worked in other jobs did not suffice to make out even a prima facie case under our employment discrimination law.

The statistical proof did not suffice according to Justice White, because otherwise:

Any employer who had a segment of his work force that was racially imbalanced, could be hauled into court and forced to engage in the expensive and time-consuming task of defending the 'business necessity' of the methods used to select the other members of his work force.

Some critics of this opinion will say that that's what the law is all about. Chief Justice Burger said so in the Duke Power Co. decision back in 1987, and hundreds of courts have repeated this refrain ever since.

Statistical proof may still make out a prima facie case, wrote Justice White, but the proper comparison is between the racial composition of the at issue jobs and the racial composition of the qualified population in the relevant labor market. He emphasized that the court of appeals had erred in holding that the relevant labor market consisted of those employed as cannery workers. It was not limited to those in the union who had sojourned to Alaska year after year on cannery line jobs, and/or to those in the native villages who habitually worked on cannery line jobs. But Justice White did not tell us what the relevant labor market was. The trial court had indicated that the relevant labor market included the general population of all those living in Alaska, the Pacific Northwest and California, and the cannery companies so argued before the Supreme Court. If they are right—and the Supreme Court did not disagree with this notion—job stratification on race, color, sex, religion, or national origin might well go unchecked.

Justice Stevens in dissent points out that "an undisputed requirement for employment is availability for seasonal employment in the far reaches of Alaska," and "there is no way of knowing what portion of the general population in Alaska, California, and the Pacific Northwest would accept this type of employment." In contrast, "comparing racial compositions within the work force identifies a pool of workers willing to work during the relevant times and familiar with the workings of the industry." "Surely," Justice Stevens concluded, "this is more probative than the untailored general population statistics on which" the employer focuses.

In addition to this general holding that one cannot prove discrimination by proving job stratification based on race, color, and national origin, the Court ruled on two other issues which would arise on remand.

The first was the question of causation. It is elementary that a plaintiff cannot recover on proof of injury alone; the plaintiff must connect the injury to the defendant and the causal link must have substance. As indicated, the Court held that the plaintiff in a disparate impact case does not make a case "simply by showing that 'at the bottom line' there is a racial imbalance in the work force." Under the new decision, plaintiffs must demonstrate that the disparity they complain of is the result of one or more of the employment practices they attack; "specifically showing that each challenged practice has a significantly disparate impact on employment opportunities."

The Court, anticipating disagreement, denied that this specific causation requirement is unduly burdensome on title VII plaintiffs. But how could it be otherwise? Justice Stevens in dissent wrote that requiring employees or applicants for employment "to isolate and identify the specific employment practice responsible for any observed disparties is unwarranted," and that "proof of numerous questionable employment practices ought to fortify an employee's assertion that the practices caused racial disparities."

This requirement of causation, and proof requirement is sure to complicate beyond end the burden on those who would end job discrimination. Many otherwise valid law suits will now die aborning.

Finally, in like vein and with like consequences, the Court held that the burden was on the employee to prove that there was no business justification for the employment practice which caused the discrimination; as well as the burden to present alternatives to that practice. The Court even cautioned the lower courts to ease off on this issue, because "courts are generally less competent that employers to restructure business practices" and consequently, "the judiciary should proceed with care before mandating that an employer must adopt a plaintiff's alternate selection or hiring practice in response to title VII suit."

Why impose on employees and applicants for employment the burden of proving that an employment requirement—a high school diploma, et cetra lacks business justification? Information about the history and purpose and consequences of employment practices, procedures and tests is uniquely in the possession of the employer. That is why the courts, until now, have required the employer to justify the practice causing racial or gender imbalance; an "affirmative defense" and it is known in the law. This third giant step backwards can only result in discriminatory employment practices holding sway because plaintiffs can't prove in court what all others can observe and abhor.

Justice Blackman joined the Stevens dissent, but was impelled to add 31 lines of his own. He compared the salmon cannery industry to a plantation economy with "a total residential and work environment organized on principles of racial stratification and segregation"; and he wondered aloud "whether the majority still believes that race discrimination—or more accurately, race discrimination against nonwhites—is a problem in our society, or even remembers that it ever was." Justices Brennan and Marshall signed onto this remorse.

ON TRADE WITH THE SOVIETS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, Soviet President Gorbachev's "perestroika" and "glasnost" have triggered debate over expanding trade and commercial ties with the Soviet Union. However, in anticipation of possible changes in the direction of Soviet policy, NATO governments should not fail to consider the security risk increased trade with the Soviets may mean to the West.

Today, I would like to submit the first half of an analysis of the risks of an enlarged trade relationship between NATO countries and the Soviet Union. The author is David G. Wigg, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Analysis at the Department of Defense. This paper was presented at the February 1989 National Forum Foundation Conference entitled "Exporting Freedom: American Internationalism in

the Era of Glasnost." Wigg recommends that any alternations in NATO's economic relationship with the USSR be embarked upon with NATO's overall strategic goals in mind.

CONSIDERING NATIONAL SECURITY IN EAST-WEST TRADE POLICY

INTRODUCTION

Until very recently, Moscow's Communist Elite have been ruling the Soviet Union as though they were a huge mafia, but with the important added governmental advantage of diplomatic privilege. Historical malevolence toward the Soviet population, single-minded preoccupation with weapons competition and policies aimed at regional and global aggression lend credence to this view of the Soviet Leadership (as does Kremlin intrigue). It also might account for the remarkably careless, wasteful civilian economic policies and practices that have brought Moscow to the brink of societal disaster.

For seven decades, successive Soviet leaders have perpetuated ideologically-driven, militarily-focused economic and investment policies in Moscow's determination to build the worlds most powerful military force as the principal tool of its foreign policy. Unfortunately for Moscow, economic strength in this world is relative, and the Industrial West sustained a superior economic performance, which left the Soviet Leadership constantly struggling to acquire and absorb superior Western technological change fast enough to keep Moscow from falling too far behind the West's rapidly advancing industrial development.

Soviet attempts to catch up with (let alone surpass) the West have failed. The final East-West battle of the economic portion of the Cold War, initiated by Stalin at the end of World War II and perpetuated by Khrushchev and Brezhnev is over—NATO has won. The West has been far ahead for over thirty years, but the disparity, coupled with East-West hostility, had become such a liability by the mid-1980's that Gorbachev was forced to throw in the towel. Because of the inherent superiority of democratic capitalism, in Soviets will, for the foreseeable future, remain relatively backward and heavily dependent on the West for essential technological inputs and "bright ideas".

The appearance of a "Gorbachev type" was inevitable. Under long-term, East-West competitive stress, the pre-1985 brand of Soviet decisionmaking was untenable and would have led to the further weakening and eventual collapse of the economy. Assuming continued Western economic dynamism, Moscow's failure to respond vigorously (and successfully) to its economic crisis would lead eventually to the decline and dismemberment of the Soviet empire. Thus, Stalin's post World War II dilemma—how to develop and modernize under the Soviet prescription while carrying on an adversarial relationship with the West and yet function proactively around the world to expand Soviet influence—had, by the mid-1980's evolved into Gorbachev's distress.

In spite of this good strategic economic news, certain circumstances and poor NATO policies are converging to the West's potential disadvantage. My comments today will address what I consider to be wrong-headed East-West economic policies, their potential cost to NATO if left unaddressed and some corrective suggestions.

NATO'S FLAWED POLICIES AND UNACCEPTABLE RISKS

In the excitement over Perestroika and Glasnost, some NATO government officials seem to have lost sight of the underlying fundamentals of the East-West relationship that argue for a far more conservative approach to both strategic and commercial dealings with Moscow. Many argue that the "new" Soviet outlook represents a major shift and that Moscow's strategic/foreign policy goals have changed from global aggression and the use of brute force to achieve its aims to inward-looking reforms and "refined" foreign policy, emphasizing international cooperation. If Soviet strategic goals have indeed changes, I submit it is due, not to a religious conversion, but to the fact that NATO has removed Moscow's historical ambitions of global domination from the realm of the possible.

ECONOMIC STRENGTH EQUALS SECURITY

It is indeed ironic that we accomplished this unprecedented feat by merely doing what comes naturally—pursuing democratic capitalism. Western economic progress has become a massive juggernaut advancing inexorably on Comecon inferiority and greatly complicating Moscow's attempts to retain military parity—only achieved by stealing the West's technical genius that Comecon could not duplicate and by squandering resources on relatively massive quantities of military hardware to compensate for its remaining technological inferiority. If Gorbachev had not reached out to the West, the Soviet economy would have eventually been (and, in any case, may yet be) relegated to history's trash heap of economic inferiority, technological backwardness and resource exhaustion. Thus, the development of the industrial West's economic strength has served not only to bring unparalleled prosperity, it has also served as NATO's first line of defense against Soviet-Bloc aggression.

A key (and currently debated) element of the Soviet and Western policy debate over Perestroika is whether and how the Soviets might achieve rouble convertibility. Currency convertibility (particularly its acceptance as a store of value) is the ultimate mark of a country's economic prowess in the global economy. It is accorded to those currencies judged by world financial markets to be most in demand, and hence from the most competitive, durable and stable economies. As with NATO's relative industrial strength, the lack of currency convertibility in the Soviet Bloc has served as one of the West's most potent (if inadvertent) defenses against the spread of the Soviet empire and other Soviet activities inimical to Western interests, by raising the opportunity costs of all Soviet hard currency spending decisions. For example, the negative strategic impact on the Soviets of the fall in the world price of one commodity—oil—and the convertible (hard) currency losses resulting therefrom has, in my view, been greater than the effects since 1980 of all NATO's diplomatic and military policies combined. In sum, the relatively more successful economic development of the Western community of nations that has left the dangerously aggressive Soviets "on the outside looking in" and locked in a debilitating resource-wasting economic system with a non-convertible currency, has served us well as a crucial (if de facto) element of NATO's security. In that regard, Western economic institutions (the World Bank, IMF, GATT, etc.) and the global cooperation embodied therein, are integral elements of the West's economic strength and their essential cohesion must be carefully preserved. Soviet membership in such organizations should not be considered cost-free to be traded in return for human rights or other concessions. The West has ample experience with the disruption that a determined Soviet presence can create in international organizations. Potential damage to Western security interests could be severe in introducing a hostile, economically indigestible and politically adventurous actor into global economic councils.

Since we are doing so well in the East-West economic competition and since it is too early to gauge the extent of Moscow's purported change of heart, why pursue policies that unilaterally weaken Western security and result in lessening the very pressures on the Soviet system that have broght them near the brink of rethinking fundamental allocational ("guns versus butter"—choices? Let's look at some of the existing and still-formative NATO policies in this area and see if we can answer that question.

FACTS AND POLICIES AT ODDS

One of the most divisive issues swirling around the East-West relationship these days has to do with the Western response to Gorbachev's siren-song for expanded trade and commercial ties. I say "siren-song" because Western businessmen have heard and responded to the same "tune" in virtually every decade since the Bolshevik revolution—much to NATO's cumulative disadvantage. The most powerful people in the various NATO governments (including ours) have stated repeatedly that "non-strategic" trade with the Soviets is harmless and is in our interest. We might recognize this description of the covergence of our strategic and business interests as the "eighties" East-West version of a statement made in 1953 by Charles Wilson, Eisenhower's Defense Secretary that ". . . what's good for General Motors is good for the United States".

Unfortunately, where East-West trade as presently conducted is concerned, what may be good for business is harmful to the U.S. and the Alliance. This is so because the phrase "non-strategic East-West trade" is an oxymoron—a statement I will clarify in discussing four concerns: the costs/benefits of the trade and the role of Western business, the importance of the NATO economies of the trade and the management of the trading relationship by diplomatic and trade promotion organs within the NATO governments.

We have already determined that the Soviets have had a longstanding dependence on NATO's (and particularly U.S.) strategic technologies that they must buy or steal. From the time of the Czars the West has played a crucial role in periodically "jumpstarting" the Soviet industrial base. Since "turn-key" plants, legally and illegally making everything from cigarettes to silicon chips which have, in turn, served as prototypes for indigenous production of tens of thousands more.

From what is known of the Soviet dependence on Western knowhow and equipment, one can legitimately question whether there is any such thing as original Soviet technology, even after 70 years of development (note Gorbachev prowling the West with "jumper-cables" in hand). We have only to look at successive weapons systems rolling off Soviet production lines to realize how much copying or "informed" weapons-counterdevelopment is taking place. When Abel Agenbagyan, one of the architects of perestroika was here with Gorbachev in December 1987, he admitted to Senator Proxmire that the Soviets rely on acquisition of NATO technologies, but he said they don't

like it and plan to kick the habit. We cannot blame them; who would want to rely on stealing the ideas of one's adversaries in order to sustain an empire. But that is not NATO's problem.

PILLARS OF NATIONAL POLICY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend Gilvin M. Slonim, president of the Oceanic Educational Foundation spoke to the student body of Hampden-Sydney College on the subject "World Ocean—The Human Stake". He outlined the maritime challenges that face our Nation and said:

Not a single ship is under construction in 1988 in U.S. shipyards. The competitive incentives to the American Waterborne Industry have been withdrawn. In the absence of U.S. understanding, the Soviets have leapfrogged our Merchant Marine, now committed to terminal decline. This high seas disaster is dramatized by realization that the enterprise which provided America's peak in competitive performance languishes now. This comes at a time when the Nation recognizes the urgency to regain its competitive drives.

He went on to outline pillars of national policy in the following discourse of wisdom filled comments:

Derived from the Preamble of the Constitution, the Pillars of National Policy outline the tenets of U.S. purpose and stature. They provide a guide for long-range, global, coherent and comprehensive National Policy formulation. In turn, the Pillars clarify the process and aims toward charting the full-span of societal enterprise toward synergystic achievement of the Nation's potential. The Pillars, as a foundation for forming policy, afford focus, direction and motivation through which a well orchestrated process seeks the long-view objectives which it forges. Their provision for global uses of the sea brings U.S. purposes to bear globally in meeting the modern world's dictates while seeking its national interests, and reinforcing its leadership of the West. Pursuant to the dictates of the Pillars, the undergirding of policy through forging a consensus as to "wherein the national interest reposes" becomes the first order in forming coherent National Policy.

My emphasis tonight has been upon a rarely discussed dimension of understanding—your "Human Stake" in the world ocean. This perspective of the "Humanities," just as the critical need for the vision of coherent policy, continues to escape American Education. Yet, its fascination is powerful; its potential for people overwhelming. To the degree that the minds of our youth are lured seaward in quest of both rewarding professions and policy, a fulfilling future of contribution can be assured; the national interest will be well served. How clear the imperative then that we draw upon the liberal arts colleges which gave the Nation its "greatest scientists." For their balanced intellectual drives, their breadth and balance of curricula appear mandatory to harness the sea's promise. With the Nation now witnessing an emerging renaissance—a "Blue Revolution," if you will, I find the challenge of Hampden-Sydney intensely compelling.

Athelstan Spilhaus, whose fertile mind conceived the Sea Grant College, and incidentally, now a Commonwealth Laureate, aimed, "to draw upon the local intellectual strength of the great American Universities." Despite the designation of some twenty Sea Grant Colleges, the program has fallen short for want of focus beyond Marine Science. America's technological turn to the sea also failed for the lack of an educational process which drew upon the broadened intellectual strength of the American Liberal Arts colleges, with curricula enriched through generalist as well as scientific excellence. Certainly, Hampden-Syndney, in the forefront of American college leadership, stimulated by the dynamic Tidewater Oceanic complex, can lead the way to the new world unfolding; new levels of achievement; new levels of human self-realization.

Just as Matthew Fountain Maury, a fellow Virginian, fathered physical oceanography with 19th Century sailing ships—his "temples of science," the timing is right to marshall liberal arts centers as cathedrals of oceanic learning. What a propitious moment to prod for oceanic understanding—and global policy as we stand poised to round the "Sea-Buoy" of the 21st Century.

THE CARDINAL PILLARS OF NATIONAL POLICY

WORLDWIDE SAFETY OF CITIZENS

Provide for: The safety and well being of U.S. citizens whenever and wherever threats may be posed, as the Nation's primary responsibility, along with that of insuring the security of the Republic.

STRATEGIC FLEXIBILITY

Place premium upon: Readiness, freedom of movement, strength, determination, will and the presence of stabilizing power, across the spectrum of contingencies, wherever threats may occur as the cornerstone of policy.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Maintain: The continuity of diplomatic relations worldwide to advance American interest pursuant to the aims and aspirations of its National policy, the democratic ideals of the Nation in defense of freedom and the pursuit of peace throughout the world.

TECHNOLOGICAL PREEMINENCE

Conduct: Resolute research and development, the technological innovation to gain and sustain modernity & leadership in world technology.

ECONOMIC VIABILITY—PROSPERITY

Regain: Competitive drives in world marketplace; trade and trade carrying; pride in preeminent product and workmanship to sustain global economy of productivity, profitability and prosperity.

MARITIME VIBRANCY

Maintain: Commercial foundation for infusion of seafaring thought (policy pattern) within mainstream; for vitality of economy; for regaining U.S. competitive drives; for logistical support for all Armed Forces—for global-trading-partner-complex contribution to global stability.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND CURRICULAR BALANCE

Regain: Educational excellence and generalist-scientific, land-sea curricular balance. Knowledge, the sine qua non of policy, requires educational reinforcement toward conceptual competence, acumen in the policy process. Balance is mandatory to gain liberal educational contribution for forming policy; for the Nation to understand the sea, to use the sea to optimum advantage—policy competence, and student motivation dictates multidisciplinary educational development, contrary to the super-specialized direction of U.S. education in the 20th Century.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL INTEGRITY

Establish through: Vigorous global research, legislation, education, citizen motivation and allied cooperation comprehensive policy, plans program and leadership to insure world-wide integrity of the environment. Create environmental safeguards based upon well documented scientific research results to sustain integrity, and to restore such environmental degradation created through meeting human needs, and the enhancement of quality of life.

RESOURCE SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Assure: Vigorous research and development measures to gain availability of critical resources; oil, cobalt, manganese, food, water, and the like, within friendly control. To this end, dramatic new sources of minerals, energy and food within the oceanic environment enable stepped up potential for vigorous development through oceanic frontier negotiation.

CONTROL OF TERRORISM

Provide: Policy motivation, the finest intelligence available, the closest allied cooperation, the means for swift decision, prompt, positive anticipatory action to curb and control terrorism worldwide. Neither national policy, nor actions to control terrorism, can be formulated without reliable information. Positive policy and intelligence vital to the Nation's global control of terrorism.

The Pillars of National Policy, manifestly, chart a constructive course to future prosperity as well as security, an elevation of quality of life. The skeletal structure blueprints a policy process to guide the Nation. In this sense, the oceanic impetus signals the need for clearer perception of the options, the opportunities, the objectives, as well as, the problems likely to be encountered. With the expanded horizons the ocean affords, full vision of its human stake through education, reserach and at-sea experience is seen. Critical, therefore, is the determination as to whether the U.S. will recognize the new need to pursue its destiny, or rather, will it cling to its traditional reaction to crises, whether military, political or economic. Will reason prevail in forming the policy process its national interest so clearly defines? After inept reaction to Ayatollah Khoumeini, in Iran, Qaddafi, in Libya, Ortega, in Nicaragua and Noriega, in the Panamaninan debacle, the need for change need not be belabored. Nor for policy! Obviously, we have had to make momentous decisions of policy before we have mastered the art of forming public policy. The challenge is new; the opportunities manifold; the need pressing.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL AVIATION POLICY RESOLUTION

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman BILL CLINGER, in introducing a resolution calling for the development of a new and comprehensive national aviation policy.

This resolution encourages President Bush to formally consider the views of all segments of the aviation community in order to formulate and submit to Congress a detailed plan for the implementation of a national aviation policy.

As both the founder of the Congressional Aviation Forum as well as the senior member of the House Transportation, Aviation, and Materials Subcommittee, I have seen first hand our air transportation system become stretched beyond its limits. Unless steps are taken immediately to cure existing problems and to prepare for the future, congestion and delays will increase in our metropolitan areas and aviation services will deteriorate nationwide.

Further, these difficulties are compounding the problem of access to the Nation's aviation system by individuals and businesses in many smaller communities around this Nation, who, without a national focused solution, will become relegated to second-class status. People in rural communities deserve better, and should be entitled to efficiently gain access to the national air transportation system. Moreover, without a clear, concise policy directive, the historical safety of our air transportation system will continue to plummet.

The resolution calling for a national aviation policy is supported by a broad and diverse coalition of organizations, businesses, and individuals representing citizens and interests which depend on the national air transportation system. It is time to stop using band-aid approaches as quick-fix solutions to our air transportation problems. This bipartisan effort will serve as an opportunity to focus and highlight the debate which is already take place. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. CLINGER, myself, and the 60 original cosponsors and support this resolution.

A TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN MERVYN M. DYMALLY

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the historic movements in the direction of peace resulting from the Gbadolite Summit on June 22, 1989, it is timely to bring to the attention of this Body, the efforts of one of our colleagues, an unsung hero, without whose efforts, I dare say these achievements might not have been possible.

I refer specifically to the quiet diplomacy of Congressman MERVYN M. DYMALLY of California, now chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations.

At the Gbadolite Summit, which set the stage for national reconciliation and hopefully eventual peace in Angola and Southern Africa, 20 African nations, including 18 heads of state, were in attendance.

Mr. DYMALLY, in keeping with his basic philosophy, believes in the importance of quiet diplomacy in opening up a meaningful dialogue and maintaining contacts with leaders abroad including African leaders.

It is of significance, therefore, that over the past 3 years, in his role as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and this year, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and member of the Subcommittee on Africa, Mr. DYMALLY in striving for peace in Africa, has travelled and personally interacted with most of the leaders of the nations that participated in the Gbadolite Summit.

More specifically within the above referenced time period Mr. DYMALLY visited at least 19 African countries, including Ethiopia, Angola, Zaire, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Uganda, Tanzania, Mozambique, Egypt, Morocco, Malawi, South Africa, Ghana, Liberia, Nigeria, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Senegal. In the process, Mr. DYMALLY has conferred frequently and in person with Presidents Mobutu of Zaire, dos Santos of Angola, and Presidents Traore of Mali and Kaunda of Zambia, the present and immediate past chairman respectively of the Organization for African Unity. He was a special guest of President Kaunda and official observer at the 1987 OAU Conference. Additionally, he has been consistently briefed on the Angolan situation by personal visits from U.N. embassy officials from Angola. Most of the Ambassadors of the African nations here in the Washington, DC area are known to confer with Mr. DYMALLY on the Hill.

Both Mr. Crocker, the immediate past Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, and Mr. Cohen, the present one, have noted how useful and constructive these inputs of Mr. DYMALLY have been in helping to pave the way for peace in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, when the record is written about the presence of a glowing light of peace in South Africa, due notice must be taken of the fact that our colleague, Congressman MERVYN M. DYMALLY, played a great role in lighting that candle when it was dark.

JAPAN BASHING

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, by singling out Japan under super 301, we have placed our relationship with that country in a very precarious position. Demanding Japan to engage in free trade when we cannot bring ourselves to do likewise will hurt rather than help our situation over the long term. Already the United States has experienced a great deal of animosity on the part of the Japanese for placing them on the super 301 hit list. Leading ruling party leader, Ryutaro Hashimoto is on record saying, "We don't like to negotiate with a pistol pointed at us." Also, at the time of the announcement, then Foreign Minister Sousuke Uno stated:

I strongly regret the lack of fairness because the U.S. has unilaterally made such a decision on the trade practices of other countries including Japan, despite the fact that the U.S. itself maintains import restrictive measures and practices to a considerable degree * * * Japan and the United States, as the two major economic powers of the world, share the responsibility to cooperate in order to realize and maintain noninflationary sustained growth of the world economy.

Rather than attempt to negotiate trade barriers unilaterally and face the wrath of our trading partners, we would have been wise to explore solutions which would not only benefit ourselves, but others as well.

I recommend the following article, "On Glass Houses and Japan-Bashing," which appeared in the June 21 edition of the New York Times, to my colleagues as must reading. This article does a fine job of explaining why naming Japan as a priority country was a dangerous move, and highlights some of the major problems we can expect to incur as a result of our action. Moreover, the author offers two recommendations that could have prevented such an unfortunate outcome—which I, by the way, suggested continually in the Trade Subcommittee during markup of the trade bill.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1989]

ON GLASS HOUSES AND JAPAN-BASHING

(By Raymond Vernon)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—It is a cardinal principle of love and war that you don't start anything you can't finish. By naming Japan as one of three countries that the Administration regards as unfair in its trade policies, the U.S. Government has blatantly violated that basic tenet. More's the pity since there are better ways of resolving trade disputes.

The Japanese and U.S. economies have become deeply intertwined over the past decade. Indeed, with hundreds of billions of dollars of Japan's assets in the U.S., each country has a hand on the other's throat. Threatening Japan in the press makes no more sense than threatening a first strike in nuclear politics.

When President Bush placed Japan on a list of countries accused of unfair practices, he was simply fulfilling the requirements of the 1988 Trade Act. But his public action was offensive in terms of international norms and unacceptable to any self-respecting sovereign state.

The heroic efforts of Carla Hills, the U.S. Trade Representative, to take the sting out of the labeling of Japan deserves this year's Nobel Peace prize. But it cannot be expected to succeed.

Apart from the style of its rebuff, the U.S. enters the dispute with dirty fingernails and soiled hands, a fact of which Japanese officials are acutely aware. U.S. breaches of its own trade commitments to Japan began in 1957, when it cowed Japan into applying a so-called voluntary restraint on the country's exports of textiles. Since then, the U.S. has engaged in steady trickle of such viola-

tions, including the restraints it has obliged Japan to impose on the export of automobiles and steel to the U.S.

The history of Japan's trading practices is nothing for that country to brag about, as scores of U.S. studies have pointed out. But the flow of stories in the U.S. media painting a picture of a wily and unreliable adversary has left a grossly distorted image of who has done what to whom.

No matter. The next steps in this exchange are easy to picture.

Already Administration officials have been taken aback by the angry public reaction in Japan—a reaction they ought to have expected. Sensing the risks of a downward spiral of destructive actions and responses, they will now try to take the sting out of their announcement in order to repair relations.

They will remind themselves and the rest of the world that Japan's official trade restrictions are among the lowest in the world. They will admit that the remaining problems of penetrating the Japanese market are no longer governmental restrictions but are more subtle and structural—problems beyond the easy reach of governments. In the end, the two countries will cover up the spat.

But the long-term loss will be substantial. The two countries will find it harder to work together to solve many of the problems in which they have a shared interest—improving conditions for the sale of services in world markets, keeping the European market open to outsiders and maintaining an adequate defense presence in Asia.

Could this sorry episode, with its unfortunate outcome, have been avoided?

What is missing in the U.S. relationship with Japan is a mechanism for addressing disputes over economic issues in a less abrasive and more effective way. Japan is attempting to use complaint procedures of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to counter U.S. actions, but the findings of GATT Panels cuts little ice with the Congress.

Perhaps the bilateral trade agreement recently concluded with Canada offers a better way. In this treaty, Congress agreed to some remarkable and unprecedented changes in the handling of trade disputes.

Compulsory arbitration is to be used on a wide range of disagreements. And in some cases, binational courts are to be allowed to decide whether the two governments are carrying out their respective laws. These courts will consist of two judges appointed by the U.S., two by Canada and one chosen by the other four. They will have all the powers of an appeals court in their respective countries.

The time is ripe to consider thinking of extending this approach for the settlement of disputes with Japan as well.

RESCUE REVISITED 14 YEARS LATER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today to bring you good news.

Fourteen years ago, Marvin Bunch, a fireman saved Lisa Greene, a 3-year-old child from certain death in an east New York City apartment building which had become engulfed in flames. The child survived and the fireman was praised as a hero by local media.

Usually the story ends here. However, in this instance, the story was revived 14 years later by the young woman who refused to forget the man responsible for her rescue. The pair was reunited to celebrate Ms. Greene's graduation from the Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn, NY through the efforts of friends, family and the New York City Fire Department.

I commend to your attention a news article appearing in the New York Daily News on June 26, 1989, commemorating this heartwarming event.

RESCUE REVISITED FOURTEEN YEARS LATER

(By Vincent Lee and Robert Gearty)

Forget for a minute about crack and crime and pilfered Regents tests and raise a cheer to a Brooklyn teenager who graduates from high school today happy to be alive and happy to be celebrating with the man who saved her life 14 years ago.

Raise a cheer to Lisa Greene, 18, who graduates from Thomas Jefferson High School in Brooklyn.

And raise a cheer to Marvin Bunch, a firefighter, who made it all possible when he pulled Greene from a fire in 1975.

SHE REMEMBERED

When Greene receives her diploma, Bunch will be there as Greene's special guest.

"I'm honored to be her guest," said a smiling Bunch, who has come all the way from Las Vegas to be with Greene.

It's a reunion of sorts for Greene and Bunch, who have not seen each other since Bunch rescued her.

"I've always really wanted to thank him personally and I wanted to show him that it was really worthwhile saving my life," said Greene. "I never really met him, but I have a future—I'm going to college—and it is all because of him."

Greene had been thinking about Bunch for a long time and felt it would be nice if he could come to her graduation.

Two months ago, Greene's mother, Theresa Greene, wrote to the Fire Department asking help in locating Bunch.

THEY FOUND HIM

Community relations specialist Anita Hinds found out that Bunch had retired as a captain in 1978 after being on the force for 28 years and moved to Las Vegas, where he is a part-time ranch hand.

Bunch, 60, didn't hesitate in accepting Greene's invitation when he received it by mail.

Bunch said he remembered the Jan. 19, 1975, incident well.

He said firefighters were called to an apartment on Ashford St, East New York, where three small children were reported trapped in a bedroom.

Bunch, then a lieutenant, and two other firefighters entered the apartment. Bunch groped through the thick smoke.

"I stepped and my leg hit something soft," he said. "I reached down and I felt someone's arm. Then I felt a leg."

Bunch realized it was a small child.

"I picked the child up," he said. "I couldn't see anything because of the smoke but somehow I managed to get to the door and I went down the stairs to the front door, where I handed this little bundle over to another firefighter."

TWO OTHERS SAVED

Greene's younger sisters, Rebecca, then 1, and Trina, 2, also were rescued.

Lisa was in Brookdale Hospital for three months recovering from her injuries.

She is thrilled that her mother and two sisters will be at the graduation.

She's also thrilled that her personal hero will also be there.

THE SOLOMON AMENDMENT IS WORKING

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, in 1982 I introduced legislation conditioning Federal higher education assistance to the requirement to register with the Selective Service System. The legislation, which was overwhelmingly approved by the Congress and upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, made it clear to all young men in this country that if you expect the benefits of this great country you must face up to the responsibilities of citizenship.

This same message, of conditioning Government benefits to the responsibilities of citizenship, will be repeated next month, when I offer an amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriations to deny Federal highway funds to States which do not require drug tests for driver's licenses applicants.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to insert a recent letter to Paul Knapp, the general counsel of the Selective Service System from George Terwilliger, U.S. attorney, District of Vermont regarding a young man who failed to register with Selective Service and yet illegally obtained Federal higher education grants. He has been placed on probation for 18 months and is required to pay back to the Government all of the $5,000 in education grants which he received.

Over 99 percent of the young men in this great country have fulfilled their duty and registered with Selective Service. A 99 percent success rate says it all about the people who carry out the Selective Service mission and it says it all about the level of patriotism in America today.

U.S. ATTORNEY,
DISTRICT OF VERMONT,
Burlington, VT, June 20, 1989.

Re *United States* v. *Carl Veilleux,* Criminal No. 89-58M.

PAUL J. KNAPP,
Assistant General Counsel, Selective Service System, National Headquarters, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. KNAPP: Please be advised that on June 18, 1989, Carl N. Veilleux entered a plea of guilty to a one-count information charging him with a violation of 20 U.S.C. §1097—student loan fraud. As part of the agreement in this matter, defendant Veilleux agreed to register with the Selective Service System on or before June 29, 1989. He further agreed to make restitution to the United States of America in the amount of $5,088.00, an amount representing student assistance grants fraudulently obtained. On June 19, 1989, United States

Magistrate Jerome J. Niedermeier sentenced Veilleux to a suspended sentence, placed him on an eighteen month period of probation, and made an express condition of probation that he make restitution to the United States in the amount of $5,088.00.

Should you have any questions in this regard, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned Assistant United States Attorney.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. TERWILLIGER III,
United States Attorney.
JOHN M. CONROY,
Assistant U.S. Attorney.

STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by Chai Ling, who was the leader of the Chinese student movement. It is a moving and courageous statement of commitment to freedom and democracy and to the country they love and hoped to change. I commend it to my colleagues and Americans everywhere.

Translation of the full transcript of a tape made by Chai Ling, leader of the student movement on June 8 as published in a Hong Kong paper: Overseas Chinese Economic Journal. Chai Ling was sobbing as she was doing the recording.

June 8, 1989, 4 p.m. I am Chai Ling, Supreme Commander of Defense of Tiananmen, I'm still alive.

On the evening of June 3, between 8, 9, and 10, the situation got worse and worse. News of people being beaten to death kept coming in, more than ten times. Our Command issued a statement, our only slogan: Down with Li Peng government.

At 9 p.m. sharp, all the students at Tiananmen stood up, raised our right hands and swore, "I pledge that for the cause of developing democracy in our motherland, for the prosperity of our country, to prevent a small group of conspirators from undermining our great motherland, to prevent our one billion population from white terror, I pledge our young lives to the defense of Tiananmen, to defend the republic. Our heads may be cut off, our blood may be shed but we will not allow the loss of people's square. We will defend to the last with our lives."

After 10 p.m., our command told everybody that since April, when the movement was mainly that of a patriotic student movement, and into May when the movement turned into a people's movement, our principle has always been peaceful demonstration. The highest principle of our struggle is peace. A lot of fellow students, workers, citizens of Beijing came to our command post and said that was not the way to conduct the struggle, you should take up arms and some of us were quite agitated. Our command said to them, we are here for peaceful demonstration, the highest principle of peace is to sacrifice ourselves. That's how we were, we linked hands, shoulder to shoulder, we came out of our tents, we were singing the Internationale and we sat on the steps of the monument, peacefully. With our peaceful eyes, we awaited the arrival of butchers, we knew we were conducting a war between love and hate, not a war between arms and violence. We all knew that this democratic peaceful movement has peace as our highest principle and we didn't want it to end with fellow students using sticks and bottles to fight those armed with bayonets, tanks, the soldiers who had lost their senses, that would be the greatest targedy of our movement.

We were just sitting there quietly, waiting to sacrifice ourselves. Then our loudspeakers played "Descendants of Dragon", fellow students were singing along with tears in their eyes, we were holding on to each other, we held hands. Each of us knew the end was here, the time to sacrifice our lives for our people was here.

There was a young student, he was 15 and he wrote his last testimony. I can't remember his exact words, I only remembered one thing he said to me. He said, "Life is strange, there is only a fine line between life and death, sometimes I see a worm crawling along, when it moves a little, it will get trampled on and will never move again." He was only 15 and he thought about death. Republic, please remember, this child fought for you.

Between 2 and 3 am, we had to abandon the public address system at the bottom of the steps and moved up to the one on the monument itself. Those of us in command went around the monument to comfort our fellow students and to mobilize them. We were just sitting there. Some said, the first row was most determined, fellow students in the back row said they are just as determined, if the first row got attacked we would not run away. I told them a very old story. "There was an ant hill with one billion ants. One day the hill was on fire, the ants realized that they must get through the fire if they were to be saved. So some of the ants held together and rolled towards the fire, those on the outer edge were burned to death but the rest of the ants lived. Fellow students, we are on the square, we are standing on the outer edge of our people." Each of us understood that only through our sacrifice could we save the republic. We sang the Internationale.

Later, several compatriots, He Dejian and others on hunger strike said they couldn't bear it. They said, "Kids, don't sacrifice yourselves here?" But we students were very determined. Some went to seek out the army to negotiate, to find someone who was responsible for "cleaning up the square" and offer to leave the square peacefully if our safety were guaranteed.

At this time, our command were soliciting the opinion of students whether to stay or to leave. It was decided that we should leave. But while we were preparing to retreat, those butchers did not keep their words. The soldiers in helmets and with bayonets came charging up the monument, before we could announce our decision to retreat. They destroyed our speaker system and defaced the monument. It's people monument, how could they shoot at the monument.

The rest of the students were retreating, we were crying, fighting. Some citizens told us not to cry, we said we'll be back, because this is the people's square. But we learned later that some students still believe the government and soldiers would not hurt them, they thought the worst case would be to be forcibly taken away. They were too tired and were sleeping in tents, the tanks made meat pies out of them.

Some said two hundred or so students had died. Some said over four thousand died in the square. The actual figure I still don't know, but those on the outer edge, those belonging to the autonomous workers union were all dead, they had at least twenty to thirty people. I heard when students were retreating, soldiers in tanks and APC's put abandoned tents, clothes and students' bodies together, poured gasoline over them and set them on fire. They then washed the grounds and not a trace of evidence was left. The symbol of our democratic movement—the goddess of liberty was ran over by a tank and broke up into small pieces. We linked hands, went round Chairman Mao's Memorial Hall towards the west and saw about 30,000 armed soldiers, many students cried "Dogs, fascists".

The soldiers were heading towards Tiananmen. We passed Liubuko, members of our command were in the front row. On the afternoon of June 3, Liubuko was the site of one of the first bloody battles, debris, trash cans, burned out were everywhere. We went from Liubuko to Chang An Blvd. We saw burned out vehicles and broken cobble stones, obviously a fierce and bloody battle was fought there but there was not one body around. We learned later that the facists were mowing people down with machine guns, the soldiers coming from the back would pick up the bodies and put them on buses or trolleys. Some of them might still be alive when picked up and must had suffocated to death among all the bodies. These fascist covered their crimes well.

We were marching back to the Square. The citizens of Beijing tried to turn us away. "Kids, do you know they have machine guns set up? Don't sacrifice yourselves!" We then left through Xidan to retreat to our campus. On the way, we saw a mother crying out loud, her kid was dead. I could see from the body that it was killed by soldiers and laying on the street. I continually received reports that people got shot. These citizens didn't commit any crime, they didn't even shout slogans.

A friend of mine told me, he was trying to stop tanks in Chang An Blvd around 2 am. He saw with his own eyes, a girl not very tall, with her left hand on her hip and her right hand waving and stood in front of a tank. She was ran over and became a meat pie. He was holding a fellow student each with his left and right hands. His friend on his right was shot and fell, then his friend on his left was also shot and fell. He was lucky to be alive. On the way back, we saw mothers looking for their kids, wives looking for their husbands and teachers looking for their students.

The machines guns all round had banners on them, "Support the correct decision of the Party Central Committee". Students were greatly angered by these banners and tore them down. The radio were saying the army was in Beijing to take care of the rioters, to maintain the order of the capital. I think I'm most qualified to say that students were not rioters. Every Chinese with conscious, put your hand on your heart, think about it, the kids were holding hands, sitting by the monument and waited for the arrival of butchers. Are these rioters. If they are rioters, would they be sitting there quietly?

How far has fascism gone? Shamelessly, against their own conscious and they telling the biggest lies. If the soldiers who mowed down innocent people are animals then what are those lying in front of cameras?

As we were leaving the Square and on Chang An Blvd, a tank was charging our way. It fired tear gas. It ran over students,

over their legs, their heads. Many could not die in one piece, who are the rioters.

It was like this, our fellow students leading in front, we maintained our pace, it was like this.

Fellow students were wearing masks, the tear gas made our throats really sore and painful. For those who have already sacrificed their lives, what would bring them back. They would forever echo on Chang An Blvd.

Those of us who walked back from Tiananmen, those who were still alive came back to Beijing University. There were many students from other campus and other cities, we had prepared beds for them.

We were in deep sorrow. We were alive. But there were many more who stayed at the Square, stayed on Chang An Blvd. They'll never come back, never. Some of them were young, very young, they'll never be back. Afterwards, we got information related to June 3. At 10 p.m., Li Peng gave three orders. First, the soldiers could shoot. Second, the army must move with all haste and they must win. By the morning of June 4, they must totally recover the Square. Third, the leaders and organizers of the movement are to be killed at will.

Compatriots! The ruthless and insane 'puppet' government are still moving the army around. A massacre is going on in Beijing, perhaps a massacre is also going on in other parts of the country. But compatriots, the darker it gets, the sooner will dawn arrive. When the fascists are pursuing senseless crack down, then a real people's and democratic republic is to be borne.

A critical life and death situation has arrived for our country. Compatriots, every citizen who has conscious, every Chinese, awake! The final victory belongs to civilians. The 'puppet' Central Committee leadership of Yang, Li, Wang and Bo is not far from destruction.

Down with Fascism.
Down with Military Rule.
People will triumph.
Long live the republic.

HYDROGEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill I offered in both the 99th and 100th Congresses. This measure is a continuation of my commitment to advance the research and development of the fuel source of the future: hydrogen. My bill, the Hydrogen Research and Development Act, is a vital part of the preparations for the post-petroleum era. Joining me as cosponsors of this measure are Congressmen TIM VALENTINE, TOM LEWIS, DANIEL AKAKA, and JAMES SCHEUER.

Interest in alternative energy sources declined dramatically in the 1980's as the Arab oil embargo of a decade ago gave way to an oil glut and low gas prices. However, this energy abundance created a false sense of security. Circumstances are quickly developing which could place the United States in a vulnerable position in the world energy market. Oil imports are increasing steadily as domestic energy production declines.

Hydrogen could be the energy alternative of the future for several key reasons. Hydrogen is one of the most abundant elements on Earth. It burns clean, producing only water vapor, and, it burns efficiently, providing more than twice as much energy per pound as compared with conventional fuels. My legislation calls for a focused national program on hydrogen R&D, and provides solid funding to implement the program.

One of the most promising near-term applications of hydrogen is its use as a fuel in aircraft. Hydrogen is already the preferred fuel for launching rockets into space. Hydrogen fuel is an important element of the National Aero-Space Plane [NASP] program. The NASP program, run jointly by NASA and the Department of Defense, will culminate in the construction of a hydrogen fueled aircraft which will not only fly at hypersonic speeds, but will also be able to rocket into low-Earth orbit. Europe and the Soviet Union are also aggressively developing hydrogen aircraft technology.

Hydrogen is ideal for use in fuel cells. Fuel cell technology combines a hydrogen-rich gas with air, and converts the chemical energy of this mixture directly into electricity—with no intermediate combustion step. Because fuel cells transform fuel directly to electricity without an intermediate conversion to heat, less waste heat is produced and very high conversion efficiencies—in the range of 40 to 60 percent—are achieved.

Another promising application of hydrogen is its use as an electric storage medium. Virtually all forms of energy, such as coal, nuclear, or natural gas, could take advantage of hydrogen for transporting energy over long distances. After 300 to 400 miles, hydrogen as a storage medium becomes increasingly cheaper than transmission through electric wires. This could allow for nuclear reactors, as one example, to be located great distances from the populated areas they serve.

Arguably, environmental concerns are the most important reason for developing alternative energy sources. We cannot indefinitely mine or drill for the world's limited fossil fuel reserves. Evidence is mounting which indicates that so-called greenhouse gases from fossil fuel combustion are causing global climate change. The emission of chlorofluorocarbons is causing the destruction of the Earth's protective ozone layer. The recent oil spills at Prince Williams Sound, Narraganset Bay, and Galveston, however, remind us that the environmental impact of oil goes beyond harmful emissions. If we are ever going to take responsibility for the environment, then we will have to dramatically change the manner by which we generate energy for our society. The dream of hydrogen economy includes using renewable energy sources to produce clean-burning hydrogen fuel.

Before hydrogen can be used broadly, it must overcome stumbling blocks relating to production. Hydrogen does not occur naturally; therefore, it must be manufactured synthetically. Electrolysis, the traditional means of producing hydrogen directly, is too costly with coventional electrical production. However, new ideas in such areas as biotechnology, photochemical generation, and coal gasification, point to potential technological breakthroughs that may dramatically change the economics of hydrogen production. Considering this challenge, it is vital that Federal commitment improve significantly in order to advance hydrogen research and development. Current Federal hydrogen programs are funded principally through the Department of Energy at a level of about $3 million—this can hardly be considered a comprehensive effort. Although the work being done is relevant, the Nation lacks a coordinated effort for hydrogen research and development.

As in so many areas of enormous economic potential, hydrogen fuel is being aggressively pursued by other nations which recognize the significant contribution hydrogen can make to their economies. Hydrogen research programs are presently underway in some 17 countries including Germany, Japan, China, Switzerland, France, the United Arab Emerites, Egypt, the Soviet Union, and Israel. If the United States is not careful it may be buying hydrogen technology and infrastructure elements from abroad. In our competitiveness-conscious society, the current U.S. hydogen effort stands as yet another example of shortsighted Federal policies which could have a harmful economic impact.

The bill I offer today is nearly identical to a measure introduced by Senator MATSUNAGA. This bill requires that a comprehensive management plan be prepared for hydrogen research and development and authorizes $155 million for implementation of that plan. The funding would be divided between the Department of Energy, $55 million, and NASA, $100 million, over a 5-year period—only $13 million would be authorized for fiscal year 1990. In addition, the bill would create two advisory panels to oversee the progress of hydrogen R&D, make recommendations, and provide necessary reports to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I request that a summary of the Hydrogen Research and Development Act be printed in the RECORD following my statement. I strongly urge my colleagues to review this legislation, and join me as a cosponsor of this bill.

BILL DIGEST OF THE HYDROGEN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

TITLE I: HYDROGEN PRODUCTION AND UTILIZATION

This title directs the Secretary of Energy to prepare and submit to specified Congressional committees a comprehensive program management plan for a research and development program designed to permit the development of a domestic hydrogen fuel production capability within the shortest practicable time. It requires the Secretary to send the Congress annual reports which include any necessary plan modifications.

It directs the Secretary to establish such a program within the Department of Energy. Requires that the areas to be addressed in the program to include production, liquefaction, transmission, distribution, storage, and utilization. It requires priority to be given to production techniques that use renewable energy sources as their primary energy sources.

It requires the Secretary to establish a technology transfer program to accelerate the application of hydrogen energy.

It requires the Secretary to prepare a comprehensive technology application plan which shall include: (1) necessary research

and development activities needed before initiation of large-scale hydrogen production; (2) assessment of appropriateness of a large-scale demonstration; and (3) an implementation schedule including budget and management resource requirements.

It requires the Secretary to consult with other federal agencies and departments in carrying out this program.

It requires the establishment of a Hydrogen Technical Advisory Panel to advise the Secretary on the conduct of the hydrogen program. Requires the Panel to submit an annual report on the program to the Energy Research Advisory Board which shall subsequently report to the Secretary.

It authorizes $3 million in FY 90 and $52 million in the remaining four years for this title.

TITLE II: HYDROGEN-FUELED AIRCRAFT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This title directs the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to prepare and submit to specified Congressional committees a comprehensive program management plan for a research, development and demonstration program for the development of a domestic hydrogen-fueled aircraft capability within the shortest practicable time. It requires the Administrator to transmit to the Congress annual reports which include any necessary modifications with respect to this plan.

It requires the Administrator to establish such a program within NASA and to prepare and transmit to the Congress a 5-year comprehensive flight demonstration plan which shall confirm the technical feasibility, economic viability, and safety of liquid hydrogen as a fuel for commercial transport aircraft.

It requires the Administrator to incorporate the goals, directions, and activities of the National Aero-Space Plane Program (NASP) in the program and plan.

It provides that the research and development program under this title shall include the development of the systems associated with the production, transportation, storage, and handling of liquid hydrogen for commercial aircraft application.

It provides that the Administrator shall consult with other federal agencies and departments in carrying out the program.

It establishes a Hydrogen-Fueled Aircraft Advisory committee to advise the Administrator on the programs established by this title. Requires the Committee to report annually to the Administrator on its activities and on the status of such programs.

It authorizes $10 million in FY 90 and $90 million in remaining four years to carry out this title.

TRIBUTE TO AVIS GREEN TUCKER

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the University of Missouri awarded an honorary degree to Avis Green Tucker, a Mizzou alumnus who is editor and publisher of the Daily Star-Journal in Warrensburg, MO. Mrs. Tucker is the first woman to serve as president of the Board of Curators. She is also chairwoman of Missouri's Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

Through the years Mrs. Tucker has made outstanding contributions to Missouri in the fields of journalism and education. I am proud to represent her, and I take this opportunity to share the news of this honor for Mrs. Tucker with the members of this body.

PROPER TAX TREATMENT FOR RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for myself and my distinguished colleague, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, legislation that would clarify section 277 of the Internal Revenue Code as it relates to the accounting for "safe harbor" leases.

Under the Economic Recovery Act of 1981, financially distressed companies were allowed to enter into safe harbor lease transactions in accordance with I.R.C. section 168(f)(8). These transactions were designed to allow corporations and cooperatives that could not use their investment and energy tax credits and accelerated depreciation deductions to sell these tax benefits to those profitable corporations that could use them. Although subsequently repealed, safe harbor leasing benefited numerous rural electric cooperatives who had entered into lease transactions.

A safe harbor lease transaction generally involves one party—the seller/lessor—who sells an asset to a second party—buyer/lessee—and then leases the asset back. The sale takes place at cost with the buyer paying a down payment and giving a note of equal payments for the balance. While the sales transaction was not in and of itself a taxable event, the seller/lessee would realize income as payments were made on the note. However, the seller/lessee also agrees to rent back the asset for payments equal to the note payments, thereby providing a deduction for the rent. Therefore, when enacted, the safe harbor provisions clearly reflected a legislative intent that the seller/lessee's interest income under the note would be offset by the rental expense on the seller/lessee's tax return—a simple wash.

An unintended tax problem has arisen for rural electric cooperatives that entered into these safe harbor lease arrangements. Section 277 of the Internal Revenue Code currently requires a cooperative to segregate its member and nonmember income and to allocate expenses in a similar manner. Thus, cooperatives are effectively treated as if they were two separate businesses. In this context, an electric cooperative could have sales to its members at a loss, yet still pay tax if it makes a profit on sales to nonmembers.

Recently, the IRS has taken a position contrary to the legislative intent, by expanding the scope fo section 277 to include cooperative safe harbor leases transactions. Instead of matching the rental expenses associated with lease transactions against interest income, the IRS now requires that the rent deduction must be allocated between member and nonmember income. This mismatching of the lease deduction and lease income creates a distortion. And again, since section 277 requires cooperatives to segregate member and nonmember business, a cooperative cannot offset its member losses with nonmember interest income. As a result, a cooperative could be subject to tax bills much larger than ever intended even when it has actually incurred a loss in its taxable year.

First, when Congress enacted the safe harbor provisions, it neither contemplated nor intended section 277 to subject cooperatives to the kind of substantial and long-term tax liability which may result under the present IRS interpretation of the provision. In fact, the provisions were intended to help distressed corporations work out their financial troubles. Second, the Service position unfairly targets and discriminates against cooperatives. Other entities that used safe harbor leasing provisions have not been forced to modify their accounting rules or otherwise to return lease benefits.

This legislation simply would amend IRS Code Section 277 to clarify that any ongoing income and deductions, generated by a safe harbor lease transaction and reported by a electric cooperative, may be used to offset each other. It's unfair to change the rules in the middle of the game, especially where the rule change would inexplicably target only our rural electric cooperatives. Failure to clarify this issue will place our rural electric cooperatives at a competitive disadvantage and likely lead to increased utility costs for rural Americans.

I urge you to support this bill to provide equitable tax treatment for our rural electric cooperatives.

The full text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. SAFE HARBOR LEASES INVOLVING RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES.

In the case of a rural electric cooperative described in section 1381(a)(2)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, any interest income in connection with a transaction involving qualified leased property which was treated as a lease under section 168(i) of such Code (as in effect before the amendments made by the Tax Reform Act of 1986) or any corresponding prior provision of law shall be offset by any rental expense in connection with such transaction before allocation of such income or expense to members and nonmembers of such cooperatives for purposes of such Code.

LABOR LEADER'S STAR ON RISE WITH AID OF ORGANIZATIONAL COUP

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to read the fine article in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch about one of our community's leading citizens, Mr. William Stodghill. Mr. Stodghill

has dedicated his career to improving the quality of life for working people. His efforts to achieve more effective union organization have earned him the highest respect of his peers. I commend William Stodghill for his tremendous achievements in behalf of working men and women and his dedication to the St. Louis community. It is with pleasure that I share the following article with my colleagues in Congress:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 16, 1989]

LABOR LEADER'S STAR ON RISE WITH AID OF ORGANIZATIONAL COUP

(By Philip Dine)

A shack. Boxing gloves. A union card. A jail cell.

Those are some of the elements that shaped William Stodghill, who was reared in the slums of Detroit and found a home in the union movement.

He rose through the powerful labor organizations in Detroit, came to St. Louis 12 years ago to straighten out a troubled local in the Service Employees International Union and was made a vice president of the international.

Stodghill scored one of his biggest triumphs a few days ago when 51,000 members of a national hospital union joined the Service Employees International Union, making it the largest health care union in the country.

Stodghill runs the union's National Health Care Division, as well as heading service employees Local 50 here.

At the local level in Detroit in the 1970s, Stodghill was considered one of the top union organizers and negotiators in the country.

Now, only 49, he is seen by many as a growing force in the national labor movement.

"I just think he's one of the bright stars," said Tom Turner, secretary-treasurer of the Michigan AFL-CIO.

"He has come a long way in a short period of time, and I think he is going much further. Stodghill can go as far as he aspires to go."

Stodghill was trying to organize the large Ford Hospital in Detroit in 1973 when his handbilling activity led to a scuffle with hospital guards and their German shepherd dogs.

Stodghill was arrested and jailed on charges of assault, which were later dismissed. It was one of several arrests for his labor activities.

"I consider going to jail for fighting for workers the highest badge of honor one can carry. That, to me, shows your commitment," he said.

If this reveals Stodghill's militant bent, there is also a conservative, self-reliant side.

"If you have a commitment and a belief, you can move beyond the slums," he says. "You can shake that. I don't say everyone can shake that, but those who try hard will."

Both aspects stem from his upbringing. He and his two brothers grew up in a shack with no bathtub and little to eat. His father, a laid-off Chrysler worker and a member of the United Auto Workers, repaired cars to support the family.

"My family stressed that we should be about helping each other, that we had no time to be jealous or that kind of thing, and that if we saw anybody going up the ladder we should help them," Stodghill said.

There was also a sense of individual responsibility.

"My father would never, ever get on welfare. He had a pride about himself that he would never take handouts. I think that's where I got some of my inner strength," he said.

The children learned the lessons. One brother, Ron, got a doctorate in education and is superintendent of schools in Wellston; the other brother, Richard, is a 32-year UAW member in Detroit.

Bill Stodghill, who played high school football, basketball and baseball, worked as a janitor in a state hospital before being elected union steward in 1958 as a hospital food service worker.

After two years as an Army paratrooper, where he rose to sergeant and was a heavyweight boxer, Stodghill was hired by Local 79 of the Service Employees International Union. There, he gained a reputation as a top organizer and negotiator.

Flora Walker, of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees competed with Stodghill in 1967, when each tried to organize workers at Detroit Memorial Hospital.

"That's a hardball kind of situation," Walker said. "But with Bill, he always gave me respect.

"I consider Bill one of the ultimate union people that I've ever met. When things were down, he could always say something that kept you going, gave you hope."

Some who worked with or against Stodghill say that his intensity could make him abrasive and insensitive.

Stodghill acknowledges that he sometimes got "overwhelmed with what I was doing and kind of rubbed people the wrong way . . ."

In Detroit, as later in St. Louis, Stodghill's activities went beyond the labor realm. He helped found the A. Philip Randolph Institute to get blacks more involved in the labor movement; helped start the Detroit branches of Jesse Jackson's Operation PUSH; and was instrumental in the passage of legislation in Michigan for statewide voter registration by postcard.

Stodghill arrived in St. Louis in 1977, after being asked by the Service Employees International Union to help revive Local 50, which suffered from internal strife among its officers.

The local's membership has tripled to 12,000, making it one of the strongest unions here. Members include public employees, janitors and health-care workers in Missouri and Southern Illinois.

Stodghill, whose salary is $35,000, oversees 15 employees and a $1.3 million operating budget. He takes pride in the local's efficient administration.

"He really turned that union around, with his organizing activities. He breathed life into the union," said Robert Kelley, president of the St. Louis Labor Council, AFL-CIO. Stodghill is on the council's executive board.

A powerfully built man at 6 feet 1 inch tall and 197 pounds, Stodghill has not shied from controversy here. In the last year, he has led a one-day walkout of the 40 City Hall workers in East St. Louis over heating problems and a six-week strike of 45 area window cleaners against four cleaning firms over wages.

In 1982, when President Ronald Reagan spoke at the Sheraton Hotel here, Stodghill organized a rally of 1,500 to protest federal budget cuts.

He has set up an educational program for Local 50 members, a credit union, a scholarship program and a summer camp in southeast Missouri where 40 children of members spend a week each summer at no cost.

He now hopes to organize area nurses. "I've asked for an audience before their group," he said.

Rep. William L. Clay, D-Mo., a member of Local 50, calls Stodghill a "very dynamic leader, not just a labor leader but a community leader as well."

Local 50's membership is evenly divided between whites and blacks. Stodghill is on the executive board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and works against apartheid in South Africa. But he resists anything that would divide union members along racial lines.

"I'm first and foremost a trade unionist," he said. "We as employees or workers must unite in order that all can share in the good life, and we cannot do that by being divided."

If Stodghill has learned to work more harmoniously with people, his intensity has not changed. He works from 6:30 a.m. until 8:30 p.m. seven days a week, without breakfast or lunch.

Stodghill does not just share the goals of the labor movement; he has assimilated its lore. Telelphone callers to his office hear rousing, old-time union songs about how "solidarity forever" can "break the haughty power of the bosses."

After a decade here, he says the labor movement in Missouri and Southern Illinois is "one of the best labor movements anywhere in the United States. We have a unity here I haven't seen anywhere else."

Stodghill has a rising national profile, as one of 12 international vice presidents of the Service Employees International Union and head of the union's key Health Care Division.

With 925,000 members, the Service Employees union is the fifth-largest union in the AFL-CIO and is the fastest growing, partly because of gains among health-care workers.

The president of the Service Employees International Union, John J. Sweeney, has called on Stodghill to rally workers in major strikes from Beaumont, Texas, to Albany, N.Y.

"He's especially good at communicating to the membership," Sweeney said. "He relates to them; they relate to him. His background certainly has had an influence on him. He's never lost the touch, the relationship, that's so important."

Stodghill helps lead the union national Justice for Janitors campaign, which seeks to draw public attention to the low wages and poor working conditions many janitors face.

Stodghill says he has no aspirations beyond his current job. He says he never even expected to head a local union, but only wanted to be a good labor organizer and negotiator.

"I'm satisfed with trying to help those people on the lower rung of the economic ladder," he said.

"I consider my self a missionary on behalf of working people.

TRADE WITH THE SOVIETS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to submit the second half of an analysis of national security risks implicit in the expansion of the trade relationship between the Soviet Union and Western nations. The author, David Wigg, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Analysis at the Department of Defense, examines the costs/benefits of trade with the U.S.S.R. and the role of Western business, the impact of this East/West trade upon NATO economies and the management of the trading relationship by diplomatic and trade promotion organs within the NATO governments.

CONSIDERING NATIONAL SECURITY IN EAST-WEST TRADE POLICY—PART 2

NATO'S PROBLEM

Our problem is that the Soviets so abuse their economic and other ties to the West in order to conduct technology theft, promote illegal trade diversions and practice espionage, as to render the interaction clearly not in NATO's interest. The East-Bloc trading relationships with the NATO business community serve as a key platform for these illicit activities. Soviet Bloc intelligence activities in the West, including those of the KGB, GRU and the East European services are on the rise across-the-board, with a top priority focus on covert acquisition of militarily-relevant technologies. To those who argue for expanded "non-strategic" trade, I ask what kind of modus vivendi can be constructed when, on the one hand Western businessmen are attempting to conduct business, while their Soviet Bloc counterparts are using the access provided by the business process to conduct covert operations targetting sensitive technologies and to promote trade diversion?

President Bush has said, "The competitive strategies approach to defense (stand-off weapons, remotely piloted vehicles, stealth systems, etc.) is designed to get us to think smart and to rely upon our advantages in new technologies. This initiative will help give us the conventional improvements we need without busting the budget". Unfortunately, the realities of East-West trading and other relationships may prevent the full benefits of competitive strategies from being realized. How valuable will the development and procurement of these breakthrough technologies be to NATO if the Warsaw Pact acquires and develops the same technologies and fields similar weapons with a minimal lag? As Richard Perle has pointed out in Congressional testimony, virtually every major Soviet weapons system incorporates US, Japanese, German, French and British technology to various degrees—in many cases, decisively.

The Soviet Bloc has spent decades building their remarkably effective networks for trade diversions and theft by espionage. This, combined with the growth in Western industrial capacity has made it impossible to stop technology loss, but sharply reducing it must, once again, become our top priority if the President's words are to become a reality. What of NATO's efforts to plug the technology leaks? Despite the heroic efforts of my two colleagues on this panel, COCOM is hardly the panacea for protecting NATO's sensitive technologies that the trade proponents claim it to be.

Hundreds of businesses throughout North America, Europe, Japan and elsewhere, ignore COCOM restrictions and ship sensitive technologies to the East-Bloc, thereby undermining NATO's technological lead in weapons. The same mentality that engages in the selling of proscribed chemical, biological and nuclear weapons technologies to unstable Third World governments is behind illegal sales to Warsaw-Pact customers, arguably with more damaging result.

To answer the rhetorical question above concerning the cost of losing military technologies, a technology-loss estimate must take into account the discount factor against NATO defense spending (about $450 billion at the moment) commensurate with the relative degradation of NATO weapons due to resulting qualitative Soviet gains. I estimate the annual dollar cost to NATO of technology loss (exclusive of national security loss for which no measure exists except the outcome of war) to range from $15 billion to $40 billion, depending on the technologies and weapon systems compromised in any particular year.

With those numbers in mind, we might ask just how important is NATO's trade with the Soviet Union? Perhaps the export numbers are large enough to mitigate the financial costs of Soviet abuses. It also might explain the massive amount of press "ink" devoted to the subject, not to mention the preoccupation with East-West economics of NATO governments' trade promotion and foreign policy agencies.

In 1987, NATO's exports to the world totaled $1.32 trillion.[1] That same year NATO exports to the USSR totaled $12.9 billion or 0.9% of total NATO exports—a sufficiently small number that it could be considered statistically insignificant.[2] It gets worse: If we assume that the overall net profitability resulting from exporting to Moscow averages a reasonable twelve percent of sales for all of the NATO commercial interests concerned, it amounts to around $1.5 billion or one-tenth of my low estimate for the annual cost of technology loss and one twenty-sixth of the high estimate—hardly an impressive cost-benefit outcome for the national interest.[3]

In considering these remarkably high negatives associated with East-West economic interaction, we could ask: *Cuibono,* or who benefits other than the Soviets? The principal Western beneficiaries appear to be the few firms that comprise the tiny sliver of the Western business community involved in the trade. We are familiar with the names of those businessmen who are most heavily engaged in trade with the Soviets. They have been providing advice to key Executive and Congressional managers for years with respect to what is best for our national interest vis-a-vis the Soviets. Their views are taken very seriously and often are incorporated into US and NATO policies.

Can we trust the business community to distinguish between their personal financial gain and our security interests and to display objectivity? In a recent article, George F. Kennan writes: "Never were American relations with Russia at a lower ebb than in the first 16 years after the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917. Americans were deeply shocked by the violence of the revolution, by the fanaticism and cruelty of the new rules, by their refusal to recognize the debts and claims arising [out of World War I], and above all by [their brazen] world-revolutionary propaganda . . . and [their efforts] to promote Communist seizures of power in other countries."[4] It turns out that some Americans didn't share the revulsion and concern over Soviet behavior described by Kennan. In fact, Stalin's first Five-year Plan might have failed if not for the assistance of International General Electric, Ford, Radio Corporation of America, Standard Oil and other U.S. companies who were heavily involved in building the Soviet industrial base well before U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933. In 1930, roughly 25 percent of all Soviet imports were from the US and in 1931, U.S. manufacturers' short-term credit was the second largest credit source available to Moscow.

In the decades since then, a small core of business interests scattered throughout the industrial West have maintained close (and presumably profitable) dealings with the Soviets irrespective of the East-West political temperature—in some cases to the detriment of Western security. On the other side of the ledger, the high costs of East-West economic interaction are borne by each and every NATO taxpayer, who de facto underwrite the activities and profits accruing to those few Western businesses involved, by shouldering the tens-of-billions of dollars in additional taxes for defense.

In sum, we have shown that NATO trade with the Soviet Union is statistically insignificant as a share of our global trade and yet because of Soviet Bloc abuse of the East-West trading relationship, it represents a huge financial and security burden to NATO taxpayers while benefiting a mere handful of businessmen—some of whom are honest but dangerously apolitical and some who are not even honest. It is imperative that NATO begin to reverse the high negatives in the East-West relationship. Soviet compliance with the longstanding human rights demands of the West—while of vital importance—is not sufficient to serve as a fulcrum for NATO decisions regarding expansion of East-West economic relations; nor should the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan affect our technology control regime.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 1989 AND BEYOND

It is, indeed, unfortunate that the gulf between public perceptions and East-West realities is such that pursuit of sound policies in the areas described above would likely be seen by many as a return to "Cold-War" measures, and thus, unpopular. Skepticism among the press and the effects of long-term Soviet disinformation programs and Gorbachev's appeal, particularly on European public opinion, allow for little chance of implementing such policies. That said, I would nonetheless recommend the following steps to begin to rationalize our relations with the Soviet Bloc:

Because the strength and cohesion of the NATO economies is a vital element in the preservation of Western security, and based on the concerns I have raised earlier, we must not take the passive stance that so-called "non-strategic trade" and other forms

---

[1] "Trade Patterns of the West, 1987," IRR No. 194-December 6, 1988, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Intelligence and Research.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Even if we assume significantly lower loss estimates it doesn't change the essential conclusion—that for the taxpayer, trade with the Soviets is a losing proposition.

[4] "After the Cold War," The New York Times magazine, Sunday, February 5, 1989.

of intensified economic interaction with the East Bloc can proceed at random. Nor do we need to undertake economic warfare and press our leverage in attempts to "extract" concessions from Moscow. There is a middle road. Before we move further in introducing Moscow into the fabric of the Western economic system, the NATO governments should demand a meeting with their East-Bloc counterparts, and after carefully explaining why the present modus vivendi for economic interaction is unacceptable, the NATO reps should make it clear that we cannot in good conscience continue to do business with the East under the present rules; either we change the rules or we don't do business. We should tell Moscow that we are prepared to wait patiently, putting all projects and technology transfers on hold, until we observe movement toward the reduction and eventual elimination of Soviet activities that are harmful to our security. Simply put, the Soviets can—at their initiative—develop "transparent mileposts" of structural and behavioral change that we can confirm as irreversible (sharply reduce the numbers of KGB and GRU agents in the West engaged in technology theft and other harmful activities, reduce aggressive microwave intercept programs, silence the disinformation and anti-NATO propaganda and halt the huge, destabilizing Active Measures assault on Western societies). The rationale for this approach is simple: if Moscow wants the same trading relationship with the US as that enjoyed by France or the UK, for example, than its overall relationship to Washington should likewise parallel the benign, friendly nature of our Western partners. Economically embracing someone intent on your destruction or on undermining your effectiveness is a recipe for disaster (or at least higher defense spending). After all, it would be far cheaper for NATO taxpayers to compensate every firm for profits foregone from suspended trade with the East than to continue to subsidize the trickle of business done under present rules through taxes for higher defense spending.

Regarding technology controls, the COCOM members need to rethink the basis for the technology protection regime, and agree on a more aggressive system for protecting the new conventional technologies that are the wave of the future. The hundreds of firms now violating the accord must be stopped!

With regard to untied lending to Soviet Bloc borrowers, NATO governments need to develop sound, all-source estimates of the hard currency costs to Moscow of funding its "empire", with the focus on those activities inimical to NATO interests. Such analysis does not presently exist. This information will enhance policy judgments concerning the efficacy of assisting the Soviets in their drive toward rouble convertibility and lending untied funds to Comecon borrowers and their impact on the cost/benefit equation (which, I presume, would only enlarge the negatives).

Perhaps a somewhat uniquely-U.S. priority should be to keep the policymaking activities concerning East-West economic security matters within the confines of the overt Cabinet structure. Over the past eighteen months, there has been a tendency for US policy in this area to be made by a small group of individuals without full participation of the Security Community. The broadest possible Cabinet participation and full adherence to process is needed to develop balanced East-West policy, truly reflective of the national interest.

The East-West trade policy portfolio should not be overly concentrated in the foreign policy/trade promotion agencies where it tends to be used to score short-term portfolio successes—and particularly as a "sweetener" in connection with Western diplomatic pursuits. The Security Community should have an equal voice. In this regard, NATO taxpayers might logically expect their trade and trade promotion agencies to spend an amount of public time and resources on promoting and facilitating East-West trade that is commensurate with its contribution to our economies (by last count, statistically insignificant at best).

Finally, the business community should be challenged to justify the overall cost to NATO taxpayers of their relatively marginal business dealings with the Soviet Bloc, the existence of which provides the East the platform from which to acquire sensitive NATO technologies. From the public interest viewpoint, in these days of "no new taxes," tight budgets and a squeeze on Defense, trade with the Soviet Bloc under present rules is not a paying proposition.

VICTORY AT MIDWAY, NATIONAL TRIBUTE IS IN ORDER

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Gilven Slonim, president of the Oceanic Educational Foundation recently shared with me the following paper "Victory at Midway," which I am happy to include in the RECORD as a tribute to Adm. Raymond Spruance and those who shared with him, under his leadership, the spectacular victory at Midway, now almost a half century ago.

VICTORY AT MIDWAY

Fifty years, though but a fleeting moment in history, affords a good measure of how well a man's contribution to his society stands the test of time.

Raymond Spruance emerged from the Battle of Midway as one of America's top-flight leaders, one who could prosecute a significant area within the global area in which the freedoms of all mankind were at risk. Henceforth, he would shoulder an ever increasing burden on behalf of his nation at the point of combat. Indeed it was for these very moments that he had disciplined his mind and body, including the conquest of fear. His victories are legendary. Each is tipped with hardship, and each indelibly marks our nation's performance in war and our nation's future well being.

This was the Spruance who led his armadas into battle confidently and courageously, a soft spoken man with character of steel and a dogged persistence that was always ingenious. The thousands of American seafarers in his mighty Fifth Fleet were ever ready to respond instantly to his direction to engage and vanquish a treacherous enemy on, over and under the seas of the Pacific. In each instance history has proved his decisions sound. His consummate performance in battle at sea was always against a backdrop of sensitivity to the humane issues of peace, and to the people of America.

Yet, paradoxically, the true measure of this man's greatness seems to elude historical chronicles, and the grasp of his nation's citizens. Though indifferent himself to public acclaim, it is time that we accord this naval hero his just due, in the form of a National Tribute on the 50th Anniversary of the Victory at Midway in 1992. After all, this man stemmed and turned the tide of Japanese naval supremacy in the Pacific.

Whether it has been so acclaimed or not, Midway stands in all-time history with the Battle of Salamis as a crushing defeat given to a vastly superior fleet, with comparable significances to the very foundations of the Western World.

A start has been made. In Washington, in 1987, the 45th anniversary of the Battle of Midway was observed with considerable interest and excitement. At the observance, Gene Wolfe, a veteran of the Pacific naval war, in a poetic tribute perhaps captured the depth of the man in the lines:

On looking back . . .
Americans may find names
Better known than Raymond Spruance;
They will find no better man.

Also, a personal biography of Raymond Ames Spruance is already under way by a man who was his Special Intelligence Officer during the years of battle. The biography is scheduled to coincide with the Nation's tribute in 1992.

The point is that now is the time to set in motion plans for a 1992 national observance of the Battle of Midway, and with it to bring the contribution of Raymond Spruance to the understanding of American citizens. For in truth Spruance in his vision and depth of societal wisdom was an early embodiment of what must become 21st Century values. It is knowledge of the sterling qualities of people such as Spruance that will motivate the American people toward a national policy consensus, and in the direction of those unprecedented potentials President Bush has assigned to the "New American Century."

Mr. Speaker, I also include an editorial comment of the Washington Daily News, shortly after the death of Admiral Spruance.

ADMIRAL SPRUANCE

Millions of Americans who never knew him probably owe their freedom to Adm. Raymond Ames Spruance.

If America had not turned the Japanese tide at Midway, it might never have had the opportunity to gather its strength and defeat its enemies on both sides of the earth. Tyranny might have engulfed the world. And had it not been for stern, razor-sharp Adm. Spruance, the United States might never have won at Midway.

His death recently in Pebble Beach, Calif., at age 83, removed another of the diminishing list of stout-hearted men who led us thru the trying years of World War II. A midshipman in the Naval Academy at 17, Adm. Spruance graduated in the upper third of his class and, at 57, became its youngest four-star admiral. He was in the thick of most of the big ones in World War II—Kwajalein, Tarawa, Roi-Namur, Saipan. He wound up his career as ambassador to the Philippines.

"Nothing you can say about him would be praise enough," said his old boss, the late Adm. Chester Nimitz.

Adm. Spruance was one of a disappearing breed, a patriot whose loyalty to his country came ahead of all else. We could all learn from his life's story.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that, due to an out-of-town family commitment, I was absent for several votes in the House yesterday afternoon. I would like to state my position on those votes for the RECORD.

Roll No. 115, "No."
Roll No. 117, "Aye."
Roll No. 118, "Aye."
Roll No. 119, "No."
Roll No. 120, "Aye."
Roll No. 121, "No."

CHINA CRISES

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues attention to two articles that I think is worth their time to read, relative to the political developments and crisis in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker as I have always said since becoming a Member of this great institution 6 months ago that our country does not have a clearly defined policy not only in China but throughout Asia and the Pacific. Another serious development also apparent with the China crisis is the ineffective intelligence network system, as confirmed by our own President, who also served as Director of the CIA.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 13, 1989]

CHINA CRISIS WITHERS THE STRATEGIC LANDSCAPE

(By William T. Tew)

The fate of China's pro-democracy movement has understandably captured the attention of the outside world. Endorsing the aspirations of Chinese reformers, President Bush has offered an initial American policy response marked by wisdom and restraint.

Most notably, he has argued that the fate of Asia's largest nation must finally rest in the hands of those leaders who can best come to terms with the demands of their people.

The administration has thus far been less forthcoming, however, in specifying how China's political crisis will affect both the strategic interests of the United States and international security. It is not too soon for American policy planners to weigh how a possible more hostile Chinese leadership could exacerbate regional tensions and complicate efforts to create a more stable international order.

The most immediate concern is who now controls China's nuclear forces and what safeguards are in place to ensure that they remain instruments of deterrence instead of lethal bargaining chips used by one or more domestic political factions.

There is little consensus in the West on what China's nuclear doctrine really is or on how the Strategic Rocket Forces, the major nuclear element of the People's Liberation Army, implement nuclear command and control.

The ultimate authority for managing China's nuclear deterrence posture rests with the Central Military Commission under the chairmanship of Deng Xiaoping and the day-to-day management of its vice-chairman, Yang Shangkun. The unsettling reality is, however, that the prospect of a unified strategic command-and-control system remains clouded.

This situation raises serious questions about whose finger is on China's nuclear trigger. It also points to the dangers of what is an increasingly fine line between political authority and anarchy in Beijing: Are the military authorities who orchestrated the massacre in Tiananmen Square just as prone to use nuclear weapons in any pending civil war in which their power could be threatened by entire armies instead of mere students?

The ambiguity of nuclear-deterrence strategy and management in China should prompt immediate demands from outside powers for assurance that China has its nuclear forces under control. Once some form of political order is restored, moreover, China should be strongly encouraged to join international efforts to implement stronger arms control agreements and confidence-building measures.

China's political crisis also has lasting implications for security problems in the Asia-Pacific region. From the time President Nixon began the process of Sino-American normalization, successive US leaders have regarded China as a strategic counterweight to Soviet military power in the Far East. By cutting off military relations with the Chinese, however, President Bush has strongly signaled that Washington will now rely more on its traditional regional security partners, including Japan, South Korea, and the Philippines.

Yet almost every US ally in this region is undergoing a domestic political crisis that could ultimately impede defense ties with Washington. While the US was certainly correct to oppose those who sifle democratic force in China, the geopolitical penalties of severing *all* military relations with China may be excessive.

US pragmatism also applies to China's continuing role in Indochina. China, along with the USSR, has been an integral player in efforts by the non-communist Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to forge a political settlement in Cambodia. China remains the most important key to any such settlement. It is the leading supporter of the Khmer Rouge, the most powerful and certainly least acceptable resistance faction contending for power in Cambodia. Without China's backing for some type of international guarantee for a peaceful transition of power, hopes for a more stable regional order in Southeast Asia would appear to be dim.

An unstable China also reduces prospects for sustaining a regional environment conducive to peaceful political change and continued economic development. For all the concern US officials and legislators have expressed about growing trade imbalances with the Asia-Pacific's newly industrialized countries, these commercial success stories remain politically vulnerable.

Hong Kong's very economic viability may be at stake in what now happens in Beijing, some eight years before that British crown colony's scheduled reversion to Chinese control. A more repressive Chinese regime will only drive what is left of Hong Kong's skilled labor force and management talent to safer havens. It could also reverse what has until now been a gradual easing of tensions with Taiwan's Nationalist government, itself under rising pressure to become more democratic.

Even Japan's uncertain domestic political climate and its concerns about the continued U.S. willingness or ability to patrol the Asian-Pacific's sea lanes can be related to unfolding events in China. If Tokyo concludes that a Chinese government preoccupied with domestic strife is unable to deter what Japan still sees as a critical Soviet regional military threat, while Washington simultaneously moves to reduce its worldwide presence, it could move more rapidly toward extensive rearmament, thereby actualizing a nightmare long disturbing to both the Chinese and Southeast Asian leaderships.

President Bush recently fashioned an enlightened yet pragmatic approach to European security. The same blend of circumspection and foresight should now be applied in structuring U.S. policies toward the Asia-Pacific at a time when the region's most culturally dominant and militarily powerful nation may be entering a phase of prolonged isolation and weakness. If Washington fails to clearly identify its strategic interests in that region, it cannot expect to influence the forces of change in Asia to the degree it may desire.

[From the U.S. News & World Report, June 26, 1989]

THE CIA'S CHINESE PUZZLE

How good has U.S. intelligence been during the crisis in China? Not good at all, according to an expert named George Bush, who has served both as U.S. envoy to Beijing and CIA director. White House sources say the President is appalled at the quality of intelligence on China. The worst example: On the day before Deng Xiaoping emerged from seclusion and appeared on TV looking in reasonably good health, the White House was told that the 84-year-old Chinese leader was so ill he had lapsed into a coma. That sort of misjudgment underscores why Bush, according to intelligence sources, intends to replace William Webster as CIA chief by the end of the year. The President is said to believe that the agency, still trying to regain its balance after the Iran-Contra excesses, needs more-vigorous leadership. Counters a CIA spokesperson: "The report does not deserve comment."

UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, last month the Economist carried a very informative article highlighting a number of our Nation's unfair trade practices which I would like to share with my colleagues. I believe it is especially noteworthy in light of the USTR's recent announcement targeting Japan, Brazil, and India for investigations of unfair trade practices under the Super 301 provision of the new trade law.

According to the Economist, almost 40 percent of Japan's exports to the United States enter under a tariff or some other form of protection. Additionally, it is stated that while

Japan operates 13 voluntary restraint agreements, the United States weighs in at 62. It fascinates me, to say the least, that we would label Japan as an unfair trading partner, when we engage in such blatant protectionist practices ourselves. I am fearful that we will be made to pay for our hypocrisy over time.

I urge my colleagues to take a close look at the following piece from the May 6 edition of the Economist.

MOTE AND BEAM

The American economy is the most open in the world. So claimed Mr. Joshua Bolten, general counsel to the United States trade representative, Mrs. Carla Hills, when he briefed journalists on the USTR's list of foreign trade barriers. That list will be the basis for deciding by May 30th which countries to name as priority targets for negotiation and, if that fails, for unilateral punishment.

Yet America is no blushing virgin when it comes to trade barriers. Around 40% of Japan's exports to America enter under a tariff or some other form of protection. An International Monetary Fund study last year concluded that non-tariff barriers against cars, textiles and steel were equivalent to a 25% tariff, a level not seen since the second world war. America operates 62 "voluntary" restraints on imports, compared to Japan's 13. Another study reports that the proportion of America's imports subject to non-tariff barriers rose by 23% during the 1980s. The figure for Japan went down.

This week the European Community published its own list of nearly 40 American trade barriers. It makes an instructive comparison with the USTR's list. The EEC criticises the United States government's "Buy America" policy. The Americans shout equally loudly about the European and Japanese equivalents. Both sides complain in similar terms about inadequate protection for foreign intellectual property rights.

Other tit-for-tat grumbles:

The USTR reckons that American motor-component manufacturers are unfairly excluded from the Japanese market. Yet America's allegedly voluntary restraint agreement against Japanese cars may have reduced imports by $6 billion in 1986.

America and Europe use almost identical language to object to "unfair" labelling and testing standards that keep out competition in each other's telecommunications market. America is threatening retaliatory action against both Japan and the EEC over telecommunications.

The American fisheries industry complains of Japanese quotas on mackerel, herring and cod. Meanwhile US protection of the merchant-marine industry costs other countries over $7 billion a year.

The USTR report waxes lyrical on the inequities of other countries' barriers to agricultural products like rice and wheat. Yet American protection of its tiny sugar industry costs mostly poor Caribbean countries some $1 billion a year in lost exports.

In sum, America's trade barriers may reduce imports by more than other countries' barriers reduce America's exports. A 1986 study by the Institute of International Economics concluded that 31 American trade barriers were reducing imports by nearly $50 billion. Half of that was accounted for by a single restriction: the multi-fibre arrangement that restricts textile imports. The total would probably be higher today as new barriers have been erected against semi-conductors, machine tools and softwood products. Even fervent protectionists would hesitate to suggest that foreign trade barriers are costing America $50 billion a year.

All figures about the "cost" of individual trade barriers are wild estimates. Furthermore, protection has ramifications beyond the goods and services immediately affected. Efforts to restrict steel or car imports may have little net effect on the trade deficit because they raise the prices of the imports that are allowed. They also push up costs in exporting industries. If they push up the exchange rate, that can increase other imports and reduce other exports.

Deciding what constitutes an unfair trade barrier is inherently subjective, especially when (as with Japan) it degenerates into claims about social structure or culture. Battles to remove such barriers can quickly turn into a war that damages both sides—and has the further effect of shutting out third countries. Hence the invention, largely by America, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which emphasises multilateral negotiation under a neutral umpire. It would be sad if the pressure generated by America's big trade deficit, which is caused by bad economic policy not by trade barriers, led GATT's chief god-parent to become its undertaker.

RESPONDING TO THE DRIFTNET THREAT

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today the Department of Commerce took a major step to protect our salmon fisheries and the ocean's environment. Under terms of the Driftnet Protection Act of 1987, South Korea and Taiwan have yet to reach agreements with our Government to regulate these fisheries. Congress passed this law to help protect our salmon from ocean-going pirates like those from Taiwan caught twice last month.

Mr. Speaker, certification is not the answer. It is the signal that the United States is serious about controlling driftnet fishing. The next step could be sanctions against Taiwan and South Korea restricting the import of fish products to our Nation. But Mr. Speaker, the next step should be an agreement that protects our salmon and protects the sensitive ocean eco-system from vessels which strip mine and ocean.

The United States and Japan have reached an agreement, which I think takes a small step toward meeting those twin goals. It does not go as far as I wanted. I had hoped that our negotiators would have convinced the Japanese that they should have expanded the number of observers. I would have preferred that transponders be placed on all drift net vessels. I would have preferred that the fishing zone not be expanded. And I would have preferred a multi-year agreement. With Japan, we got promises of future action. Mr. Speaker, I first proposed using transponders over a year ago because finding these fishing vessels should not be a game of hide and seek. Based on the tentative promise of action, we are waiting for next year to see it implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the decision to certify Taiwan and South Korea is important, because it sends a signal that we are serious. In 60 days, the President must decide if sanctions are in order. I hope that before he reaches that critical decision, acceptable agreements can be developed.

What would I consider an acceptable agreement? Let me be clear: First, there must be transponders to help track these vessels. The technology exists, now we need the will to put that technology to work. Second, there must be a scientifically valid number of observers to monitor the actual harvests from these driftnets. With nets stretching 30 or even 40 miles in length, all living creatures caught in these vast loops of nets are caught. How many salmon are caught? How many seabirds and marine mammals are killed? How many fish are swept up only to be discarded? We need to know. Third, Mr. Speaker, the zones should not be expanded. Proposals to move the area further north will endanger more of our salmon and will not provide more squid. Finally, we need a multi-year framework. This problem cannot be solved in 1 year. It will take many years of careful monitoring to teach the foreign driftnet fleets that they must live within international regulation.

What should our Government be doing? I have written to Secretary of Commerce Mosbacher urging him to meet with fishermen in Washington State and Alaska this fall, after the season, to hear firsthand the threat. I know he is interested in developing a solution to this problem. He should hear from the affected U.S. citizens. Second, I encourage him to stay on top of the subject. Our Government needs a multi-year action plan. That plan should include protecting the whole North Pacific from illegal fishing activities. If we develop a long-term plan, that fishery can support American business for decades to come. If we develop a multi-year plan, we will have the baseline information to know how that sensitive eco-system is being harmed. Setting an agenda and keeping the bureaucracy on target requires leadership from the Secretary of Commerce.

I also encourage the Secretary of Commerce to work with the Secretary of State to continue to press our case in all meetings with Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. The Secretaries of Commerce and State should put this item on their agendas. This is not a parochial issue of concern just to fishermen from the Pacific Northwest; it is about protecting the oceans. International leaders have called the oceans the common legacy of mankind. There can be no higher calling than protecting that common legacy.

Mr. Speaker, certification of Taiwan and South Korea is only one step toward protecting our oceans and our salmon. The time has come to regulate driftnets.

Thank you.

CALAVERAS BIG TREES

HON. RICHARD H. LEHMAN

OF CALIFORINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to complete a project Congress began in 1909—protection of Calaveras big trees. Inspired by the conservation policies of Theodore Roosevelt and a group called the California Club, in 1909 Congress enacted legislation to authorize the Calaveras Big Trees National Forest in California.

The act empowered the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire land on both sides of the North Fork of the Stanislaus River to protect majestic groves of big trees—especially giant sequoias—and to promote their reproduction. The 1909 act was not implemented by the U.S. Government until 1953 when the Calaveras Big Trees National Forest was carved from private land in the area. The new national forest, with only 379 acres, became the smallest national forest in the Nation, and its management was delegated to the nearby Stanislaus National Forest.

In the intervening years between congressional recognition of the big trees area and its actual creation as a national forest, California State officials—worried by federal inaction—moved at a faster pace to protect the Calaveras big trees. These Californians enlisted the help of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. Olmsted visited the Calaveras groves in 1928 and included them in a list of potential sites which were the foundation of the California State Park System. In the 1930's and 1940's California acquired land on both sides of the North Fork of the Stanislaus River. This land became known as the Calaveras Big Trees State Park.

Today, the 379 acres of the Calaveras Big Trees National Forest lies between the north and south groves of the 6,000-acre Calaveras Big Trees State Park. Although both the state and Federal land is set aside for the protection of big trees, because of the size and location of the Federal parcel, the U.S. Forest Service can provide custodial care only—with no recreation or resource management, no trails and no ranger assigned to actively manage the big trees on an ongoing basis. As a result, the sugar pine, ponderosa, and sequoia big trees in the Calaveras National Forest are fast succumbing to an encroaching understory of white fir trees. If this situation remains unchanged, all nonfir species will eventually decline.

The bill I am introducing today directs the U.S. Forest Service to transfer the Calaveras Big Trees National Forest to the State of California for inclusion in the Calaveras Big Trees State Park and for that purpose only. The objectives of my legislation are simple:

First, to provide permanent protection for sugar pine, ponderosa pine, and giant sequoia trees which are known generally as the Calaveras Big Trees;

Second, to unify the big trees area to enhance natural resource management and protection; and

Third, to increase visitor access to an enjoyment of the entire Calaveras big trees area through more intensive and active State management.

Mr. Speaker, this is a small bill which will have long-lasting benefits. If you take a walk through the Calaveras Big Trees State Park, you will find serenity and a natural haven from our busy, crowded world. To see the big trees, it will be necessary to get out of your car and go back in time. You will see the descendants of the Calaveras big trees which lived 180 million years ago. You will see the stump of 1,000-year-old tree which is 13 feet in diameter, standing as a reminder of man's willingness to dismantle one of the largest living things on earth.

Mr. Speaker, transfer of 379 acres from the national forest to the California State Park System will protect untouched stands of sugar pine, ponderosa, and giant sequoia trees and will further the enjoyment of visitors to the Calaveras big trees State park. We have a unique opportunity to leave this small, but important legacy to future generations. The conflicts will be few. The benefits will be many.

OUR FLAG DESERVES SPECIAL TREATMENT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Texas versus Johnson Supreme Court decision which permits the desecration of the American flag as a form of free speech.

My district, In Nevada, is comprised of many outspoken and courageous Americans, especially veterans—men and women who have fought for the betterment and protection of America and American values. Many Nevadans have written to me, expressing their outrage at this decision. I am appalled at the decision which permits the burning and ultimate desecration of our flag.

Our Nation was forged out of a common commitment to freedom—a commitment held dear by men and women of disparate backgrounds. This common bond remains as one of the testimonies to the enduring strength of our Nation.

And yet, the only tangible symbol of this strength, our American flag, is legally subject to permissible desecration. However well-intentioned the logic and reasoning of this decision, I can only speak with my heart and say how much I deplore the decision.

How many of you were moved, while hearing Senator JOHN MCCAIN at the Republican National Convention last summer, tell us the story of his experience as prisoner of war in Vietnam with Mike Christian, a young man from Alabama, who pieced together an American flag out of strips of red, white, and blue cloth. JOHN MCCAIN and Mike Christian were held captive with a group of other Americans in one room. Each day, Mike Christian would add a little more to the flag. They would say the Pledge of Allegiance to their tattered flag every day and then hide it away, knowing, full well, that exposure of the flag would mean certain punishment. Mike Christian was punished, beaten severely. But, after his fellow prisoners of war nursed him back to health, he continued to piece together the flag.

These men weren't much different from men and women who fought for freedom in our country 200 years ago. Men and women of liberty challenge us to remember the mission of our country, no matter what age they may find themselves in. Although they may have vastly different heritages, they have a common heritage in the American flag—a heritage which knows no time—a heritage which is sealed by a common love for our country and for one another.

JOHN MCCAIN and Mike Christian and their group of great Americans may have been prisoners of war, but their mutual love of country surely sustained them with every added strip of cloth which was their flag.

How do you tell Senator MCCAIN and Mike Christian that their meticulously created flag can be burned by legal decree of the Supreme Court, as an expression of freed speech? Unquestionably these men of unmatched heroic fiber can withstand the awful affront of a burning flag.

How would I tell my father, were he alive today, that the country he served so proudly, as a brigadier general, now permits the desecration of the flag in the name of free speech? And how do I explain the decision to my brother, a West Point graduate and a captain, who has spent a lifetime serving his country? What would I say to my mother, who moved us from base to base, unbegrudgingly, because our country called my father to move to another base. Her abiding faith and pride in her family's service to our country sustains me to this day. Love of country, for me as a child, and, for me as a Congresswoman, has always been and continues to be a family affair.

My family, like many American families, gave their all to support our father and our brother, and the country they loved so well. A burning flag does not shake our faith and love for our country one iota. We can endure it. But many Americans like my father, my brother, JOHN MCCAIN, and Mike Christian have endured much more for the American cause. But sometimes, a slap in the face from your family of America, is harder to endure than the unspeakable trials of war. The prison cell in Vietnam, where commitment was a cornerstone, is more comforting than the Supreme Court decision.

I have cosponsored several bills which would offer the people of Nevada, and the people of this country, an opportunity to vote, up or down, on the Supreme Court's decision through the constitutional amendment process. Surely, the elimination of the burning of the flag as an expression of speech does not jeopardize the intent of the drafters of the first amendment.

Many methods of speech remain available to those who do not agree with our Government. The flag holds a special place in our Nation's history and deserves special treatment under the Constitution.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, while the Members of Congress express their outrage at the recent Supreme Court decision on the U.S. flag, I want to bring to your attention the real damage the Supreme Court has done to all Americans with its recent decisions on civil rights issues.

The following memo was prepared By Representative JOHN CONYERS, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CONYER'S memorandum:

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Martin v. Wilks—June 12, 1989.

White firefighters sued the city of Birmingham, Alabama and the Jefferson County Personnel Board, in District Court, alleging that, because of their race, they were being denied promotions in favor of less qualified blacks in violation of federal law. Consent decrees, which included goals for hiring blacks as firefighters and for promoting them, had been entered previously by the city and the Board as a result of actions that had been brought by black individuals and the NAACP. The District Court held that respondents were precluded from challenging employment decisions taken pursuant to the consent decrees, even though they had not been parties to the proceedings in which the decrees were entered.

By a 5-4 vote, the Supreme Court held that the respondents are not precluded from challenging the employment decisions taken pursuant to the consent decrees.

The impact of the decision is that it eases the way for white males to challenge court approved affirmative-action plans.

Patterson v. McLean Credit Union—June 15, 1989.

A black woman who was hired by the McLean Credit Union as a teller and a file coordinator for 10 years was laid off. She brought action in the District Court under 42 U.S.C. 1981, alleging that respondent had harassed her, failed to promote her to accounting clerk, and then discharged her, all because of her race. The District Court determined that a claim for racial harassment is not actionable under 1981. Also, the court said that the woman had to prove she was better qualified than the white employee who allegedly had received the promotion, in order to win her promotion-discrimination claim.

The Supreme Court agreed with its decision in *Runyan v. McCrary*, 47 U.S.C. 160, that 1981 prohibits racial discrimination in the making and enforcing of private contracts. But, it narrowed its scope. The Court claimed that 1981 does not apply to conduct which occurs after the formation of a contract and doesn't interfere with contract obligations, which includes breach of the contract's terms as well as imposition of discriminating working conditions. The Court declared that the District Court erred when it said Patterson had to prove that she was better qualified for the promotion. For, under 1981, a plaintiff must only prove purposeful discrimination, in order to prevail.

Wards Cove v. Atonio—June 5, 1989.

A group of nonwhite salmon cannery workers filed suit under Title VII alleging that their employer's hiring and promotion practices were discriminatory. They claimed these practices had set up a sort of racial stratification within the work force. This was evidenced by the fact that the unskilled "cannery jobs" were filled by nonwhites and the "noncannery jobs", most of which are classified as skilled positions and pay more than the cannery positions, are filled by white workers. The District Court rejected the cannery workers claim based on the fact that there was an overrepresentation of nonwhite works in the cannery job due to a hiring hall agreement with a predominately nonwhite union. The Court of Appeals reversed the decision, holding that the cannery workers had a prima facie case of disparate impact in hiring for both types of jobs. This was concluded based on statistics showing a high percentage of nonwhite workers in cannery jobs and a low percentage of such workers in noncannery jobs. They also decided that once disparate impact caused by employment practices has been proven, the burden is shifted to the employer to prove the practices are of a business necessity.

The Supreme Court overturned the Court of Appeals decision and ruled that the mere comparison of the percentage of the cannery workers who are nonwhite and the percentage of noncannery workers who are nonwhite is not proof enough to make a prima facie disparate-impact case. It further placed the burden of proof on the plaintiffs, in such a case, to show discrimination in hiring and promotion practices. And it made it harder to use statistics to prove discrimination under Title VII. And the Court relieved employers from the burden of justifying that their hiring and promotion practices are of a business necessity.

The case was sent back the lower courts. The plaintiffs must show on some other basis that the underrepresentation of minority groups in the most desirable jobs violated Title VII. The plaintiffs must demonstrate that the statistical disparity complained of is the result of 1 or more of the employment practices, specifically showing that each challenged practice has a significantly disparate impact on employment opportunities for whites and nonwhites.

Will v. Michigan—June 15, 1989.

Will filed suit under 42 U.S.C. 1983 alleging that the Michigan Department of State Police and the Director of State Police had denied him a promotion for an improper reason. The state court ruled in favor of Will, finding that both respondents were considered "persons" under 1983, which provides that any person who deprives an individual of his or her constitutional rights under color of state law shall be liable to that individual. The State Court of Appeals overturned the decision and said the State is not a person under 1983, but didn't immune the Director. The State Supreme Court agreed that the state is not a person under 1983 as well as held that a State Official acting in his or her official capacity also is not such a person.

The Supreme Court declared that neither states nor state officials acting in their official capacities are "persons" within meaning of 1983.

Lorance v. AT&T Technologies—June 12, 1989.

AT&T Technologies had set up collective bargaining agreements before 1979, which determined a worker's seniority on the basis of years of plantwide service, and plantwide seniority was transferable upon promotion to a more skilled "tester" position. In 1979, a new agreement changed this seniority rule and declared that seniority in "tester" jobs is dependent upon the amount of time spent as a tester. In 1982 petitioners—women employees who were promoted ot tester position between 1978 and 1980—received demotions that they would not have sustained had the former seniority system remained in place. In 1983 they brought action in the District Court alleging that AT&T had violated Title VII by adopting the new seniority system with the purpose and effect of protecting incumbent testers—jobs traditionally dominated by men—from female employees who had greater plantwide seniority and who were becoming testers in increasing numbers. Summary judgement was granted and affirmed by the Court of Appeals on the ground that the charges had not been filed within the required period "after the alleged unfair labor practice occurred," 706(e) of Title VII, 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(e).

The Supreme Court affirmed.

Richmond v. Croson—January 23, 1989.

The city of Richmond, Va adopted a Minority Business Utilization Plan requiring prime contractors awarded city construction contracts to subcontract at least 30% of the dollar amount of each contract to one or more Minority Business Enterprises, which the Plan defined to include a business from anywhere in the country at least 51% of which is owned and controlled by black, Spanish-speaking, Oriental, Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut citizens. Pursuant to the Plan, the city adopted rules requiring individualized consideration of each bid or request for a waiver of the 30% set-aside, and providing that a waiver could be granted only upon proof that sufficient qualified minority businesses were unavailable or unwilling to participate. After the Croson Co., the sole bidder on a city contract, was denied a waiver and lost its contract, it brought suit under 42 U.S.C. 1983, alleging that the Plan was unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. The Federal District Court upheld the Plan and the Court of Appeals affirmed. On the respondents petition for certiorari in this case, the Supreme Court vacated and remanded for further consideration. On remand, the Court of Appeals held that the city's Plan violated both prongs of strict scrutiny, in that (1) the Plan was not justified by a compelling governmental interest, since the record revealed no prior discrimination by the city itself in awarding contracts, and (2) the 30% set-aside was not narrowly tailored to accomplish a remedial purpose.

The Supreme Court affirmed the judgment.

Jett v. Dallas—June 22, 1989.

Norman Jett, a white male, was employed by the Dallas Independent School District (DISD) as a teacher, athletic director, and head football coach at South Oak Cliff High School, a predominantly black school. After repeated clashes with the school's principal Todd over school policies and Jett's handling of the school's football program, Todd recommended that Jett be relieved of his duties as athletic director and coach. The DISD's Superintendent Wright affirmed Todd's recommendation and resigned Jett to a teaching position in another school, where he had no coaching duties. Jett brought action in the District Court alleging that Todd's recommendation was racially motivated, and that DISD, acting through Todd and Wright, had discriminat-

ed against him on the basis of race in violation of 42 U.S.C. 1981 and 1983 and the Equal Protection Clause. The District Court upheld a jury verdict in Jett's favor. The Court of Appeals reversed in part and remanded, finding that the District Court's jury instruction's as to the DISD's liability under 1983 were deficient, since (1) they did not make clear that, under *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658, such liability could be predicated on the actions of Todd or Wright only if those officials had been delegated policymaking authority or acted pursuant to a well settled custom that represented official policy; and (2) even if Wright could be considered a policymaker for purposes of the transfer of personnel, the jury made no finding that his decision to transfer Jett was either improperly motivated or consciously indifferent to the improper motivations of Todd. The Court of Appeals rejected the District Court's conclusion that the DISD's 1981 liability for Todd's actions could be predicated on a respondent superior theory, noting that *Monell* had held that Congress did not intend that municipalities be subject to vicarious liability under 1983 for the federal constitutional or statutory violations of their employees, and declaring that to impose such liability for only certain wrongs based on 1981 apparently would contravene the congressional intent behind 1983.

The Supreme Court affirmed the judgment to the extent it holds that the school district may not be held for its employees' violation of the rights enumerated in 1981 under a theory of respondent superior. We remand the case to the Court of Appeals for it to determine where final policymaking authority as to employee transfers lay in light of the principles enunciated by the plurality opinion in *Praprotnik*.

RIGHT IS RIGHT

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, today, as President George Bush asked the Congress to do, I am introducing an amendment to the Constitution which will make it illegal to burn or otherwise desecrate the flag of the United States.

I am saddened that it is necessary to introduce this amendment; indeed I believe that the Constitution should only be amended with great care. However, the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision which declares that the U.S. flag may be publicly burned or otherwise mutilated cannot go unanswered.

For over 200 years, the American flag has been more than just a symbol of our Nation, it has been a part of our national unity, part of what holds us together as a people.

Unlike other symbols which we hold dear, the American flag is something special. It is the American flag that stands guard over our government buildings, our schools, our offices. It is the American flag that our athletes proudly march behind as they enter international competitions. It is the American flag that our young men and women so bravely defend on battlefields around the world. And it is the American flag which covers the bodies of the brave soldiers killed while defending the Stars and Stripes.

Just as the spectators in the courtroom wept when the U.S. Supreme Court announced its verdict, all of America must grieve at the thought of Old Glory burning simply to make a political statement.

As the Justices who opposed the Court's ruling said in their dissenting opinion, how can our Government ask servicemen and women to fight and die in foreign lands for our flag, if we are not willing to defend it here at home?

I am deeply disturbed that some liberal Democrats see no need to amend the Constitution, figuring that this firestorm will play itself out and the Nation will soon turn its attention to other matters.

There is no doubt that all Members of Congress have a deep respect for the U.S. flag; but it is shocking that anyone in the Democrat majority would appear to be defending the right to publicly burn our flag.

Liberals, like the ACLU, cry out that burning the flag is just exercising free speech. Try telling that to the mother who lost a son fighting for that flag on Omaha Beach. Try telling that to the family who lost a brother at Midway or Iwo Jima.

When the battle of Iwo Jima was finished, over 6,000 Americans lay dead. And when the U.S. Marines reached the top of Mount Suribachi on that tiny island, they raised high a piece of pipe from which fluttered the U.S. flag.

In Korea, when our troops landed at Inchon, within an hour they raised high our flag. And in Vietnam, thousands of our boys fought through the jungles for their country and for their flag.

It was during the Vietnam war that the Federal law against burning the flag was passed by Congress. You cannot ask a soldier to die abroad for something you are not willing to protect here at home.

Unfortunately, apparently the liberal Democrats don't seem to understand the deep meaning that the flag has for millions of Americans. The most liberal believe that it is more important to allow people to burn our flag than it is to protect this sacred symbol. Other liberal Democrats say simply—well, we'll have to pass a law. We have passed a law—there was a Federal law prohibiting the burning of the flag and 48 of our States have laws prohibiting the burning of the flag. It is those laws that the U.S. Supreme Court has struck down. The only recourse is for a constitutional amendment.

And while we must always guard an American's right to free speech, it is one thing to speak about your beliefs and quite another to burn a symbol as sacred as the American flag. Talking is one thing, physical abuse and acts of violence are another. It is sad to imagine that it is now illegal for many people to burn a pile of leaves in their back yards, but legal to burn the American flag.

In order to pass a constitutional amendment, I am confident the voters of this Nation will elect men and women to the Congress of the United States who will actively work for the passage of such an amendment.

There has never been a more clear or graphic example of the need to elect people to the Congress of the United States who believe in conservative values. If we cannot elect a Congress that will protect our flag, then what is next?

So far this year the House of Representatives has been shamed by a disgraced Speaker of the House who was forced to resign for wrongdoing, and by the resignation of the number three Democratic leader in the House for financial misconduct. Now, we have Democratic leaders saying there is no need for a constitutional amendment to protect our flag. Clearly, something is wrong with the Congress and it is up to the American people to throw out Congressmen who condone such activity.

I am dedicated to working to enact a constitutional amendment to protect our flag, and I hope that millions of Americans will join with President Bush and our fellow Republicans, conservatives, and concerned Democrats in this effort.

PRIVATIZATION 1989

HON. DANA ROHRABACHER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to seriously advance the idea of privatization. Governments throughout the world have begun to shift responsibilities from the public sector to the private sector. The Reason Foundation recently released a report entitled "Privatization 1989." It is a critical and meaningful document and I asked that a section of it be read into the RECORD.

The article follows:

PRIVATIZATION 1989: THIRD ANNUAL REPORT ON PRIVATIZATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Futurist John Naisbitt sees privatization as a worldwide trend. "Socialism and the welfare state will wither as countries begin to privatize services formerly supplied by governments," he said last November. "Debate about selling the United States Postal Service will intensify." Naisbitt Group Executive Vice President Marilyn Block predicts that 1989 will see privatization beginning to be applied to public schooling.

Although President Bush did not make privatization a campaign issue, he did say in his State of the Union address that he would pursue private-sector alternatives to state-supported services. He made explicit his belief that the private sector can do certain things better than the public sector.

Forecasters expect that budget pressures will lead to continued shifts of functions from the federal government to the private sector during the coming four years. Even the Kiplinger Washington Letter of November 4, 1988, predicted that "Government will step up privatization of commercial activities in '89. Thousands of such jobs will be let to private firms because it's cheaper."

Another sign of the times was the election last summer of Philadelphia Mayor Wilson Goode as cochairman of the Privatization Council, a national trade association. Democrat Goode's cochair is Prescott Bush, the President's brother. Their cochairmanship of the leading privatization trade organization symbolizes the growing bipartisan

appeal of utilizing the private sector to provide governmental services.

Privatization continues to seep into this country's popular culture. Harper's magazine did a satirical piece on privatizing the U.S. military that inspired several similar pieces by other journals. In addition, NBC's popular TV show "L.A. Law" showed a private court as a low-cost, effective alternative to the civil court system.

It's no surprise that privatization has become a household word. The number of news articles mentioning privatization, as measured by the Reason Foundation's clipping services, increased from 2,195 in 1987 to 3,838 in 1988—an increase of 75 percent. Much of that increase was due to publicity attending the work of the President's Commission on Privatization, which issued its report last March. But it was also due to the continued nationwide and worldwide trend toward shifting functions from the public sector to the private sector.

This trend is amply documented in this third annual report on privatization.

II. SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

Privatization: A worldwide trend

Governments around the world continued to shift functions and responsibilities to the private sector in 1988. A hefty $43 billion worth of such sales took place during 1988. That brought the cumulative total, worldwide, to $160 billion over the past five years—a tremendous shift of resources and control. Britain and Japan continued to be the leading sellers, with British Steel and Nippon Telephone & Telegraph as the largest of 1988's share-offerings.

Selling state-owned enterprises is increasingly important in the Third World, as well. Nigeria issued a Privatization and Commercialization Decree that will result in the sale of 67 firms, including 12 banks, Nigeria's electric power authority, and various other state-owned industries. Chile plans to sell the government pension fund, and has already sold $1 billion in state firms since 1985, leaving only 20 of 500 companies in state hands.

But asset sales alone do not measure the full extent of privatization. Build-Operate-Transfer (B-O-T) agreements have become increasingly popular. An agreement whereby a private company agrees to build and operate a public facility for a set period of time (with the title reverting to the government when the agreement expires), B-O-Ts have been particularly useful in developing major new infrastructure.

Among the major B-O-T projects under way in 1988 were a 181-mile private tollway in China, a major power plant and rail transit system in Turkey, a new harbor tunnel in Sydney, Australia, and power plants in the Philippines. (The world's largest infrastucture project—the Channel Tunnel between Britain and France—is not a B-O-T project, in that title will remain with its private owners, Eurotunnel.)

Many other governments especially in the Third World, are taking steps to liberalize their economies, so that private enterprise can play a greater role. For example, Morocco has divested its state agricultural marketing/export agency. Tunisian President Ben Ali, while pledging to privatize 100 state enterprises, has also begun deregulating parts of the economy.

One of the most dramatic swings towards the private sector is occurring in the communist world. The Soviet Union has now joined China in allowing farmers to lease land from the state and purchase their own trucks, tactors, and other equipment. Both have now launched programs whereby individuals can purchase their house or apartment from the state.

Communist countries are also permitting private businesses to start up, generally in the guise of "co-operatives." Hundreds of co-ops have started up in the Soviet Union in the past year, though they are severely limited in their access to materials and equipment and may use only their own "members" as workers. Poland and Hungary have gone further. Some 23,000 co-ops have been authorized in Poland, and they are now permitted to hire up to 50 workers per shift. Hungary is dispensing with the co-op disguise, allowing "limited companies" which can employ up to 500 people. The Budapest stock market has reopened, and as of January 1, 1989, anyone may legally purchase shares. Poland has authorized limited share-ownership, as well.

Perhaps the most significant development in the Soviet Union is the breaking up of some collective farms and the leasing out of farm lands to individuals, families, and small groups. One-fifth of the country's 50,000 farms have begun leasing land and equipment to individuals and families over the past two years.

Washington brings up the rear

Overseas, governments of all political complexions are selling off state-owned assets and enterprises, but the United States is virtually alone in having no serious national commitment to privatization. During the entire eight years of the Reagan administration, the only large federal enterprise to be sold off was Conrail (sold in 1987 in a public stock offering for $1.6 billion). During 1988 the government also reached an agreement to sell the Great Plains Coal Gasification plant for $600 million, spread out over the next 21 years. In addition, $4.6 billion was realized from the sale of federal loan assets during 1987-88.

The President's Commission on Privatization set forth an agenda for privatization at the federal level, in its March 1988 report. It recommended that the government sell Amtrak, the Postal Service, and the Naval Petroleum Reserves, as well as continuing to sell federal loan assets. Its other recommendations concerned increased use of vouchers (in housing and education) and contracting-out of services.

While ambitious compared with the Reagan administration's record, this agenda pales in contrast to what is going on overseas. In response, a group of 10 think tanks led by the Reason Foundation formed an ad-hoc Privatization Task Force, which issued a more sweeping privatization agenda in July 1988. It identified some $316 billion in potential revenue from the sale of federal assets and enterprises, including federal commercial timber lands, Amtrak, electricity operations, postal service, airports, and air traffic control. While at first glance, these appear to be fairly radical proposals, in fact they are quite consistent with privatization activities currently under way in other countries:

Passenger Railroads: Amtrak is assumed to be unsaleable because it loses large sums of money. But two major money-losing passenger railroads—Japan National Railways and British Rail—are now in the process of being privatized. JNR has already been broken up into smaller companies and had part of its huge debt written off; for 1988 the six railroad spin-off companies all turned in profits. British Rail's privatization mode is currently under study.

Electricity Operations: While the Tennessee Valley Authority and the five Power Marketing Administrations are considered political sacred cows, comparable electricity operations elsewhere are routinely being divested to the private sector. One of the primary examples is Britain's Central Electricity Generating Board, which is being broken up into two generating companies and a national transmission grid, all of which will be sold during 1990-91. Among the other countries selling or planning to sell electric power operations are Argentina, Austria, Chile, Finland, Israel, Nigeria, the Philippines, and South Africa.

Postal Services: Although no government has yet sold its postal service, many have broken up their state-owned post-and-telecommunications monopoly and sold off the telecoms portion. Among those which have done (or announced plans to do) this are Britain, Finland, Israel, the Netherlands, New Zealand, South Africa, and South Korea. Japan is considering privatizing its Postal Savings System (the world's largest taker of deposits), and Britain and the Netherlands are considering similar moves. And both the Netherlands and New Zealand are discussing the possible sale of the postal service itself.

Airports and Air Traffic Control: Proposals to sell the FAA's air traffic control system and the federally owned airports (Dulles International and Washington National) have received only lukewarm consideration. Yet Britain privatized British Airports Authority (operator of Heathrow, Gatwick and others) in 1987, and among the other countries planning privatization of at least some major commerical airports are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Japan, and New Zealand. The latter has "corporatized" its air traffic control system, making it entirely user-fee-funded as of 1987, and is considering privatizing it. And Britain's ATC system has been decentralized, with airports taking over responsibility for control towers and local ATC services, some of which are now contracted out to private firms.

These examples illustrate that the potential of privatization in the federal government is far greater than is generally realized. Hundreds of billions of dollars could be realized by the sale of the kinds of federal enterprises which are routine objects of privatization overseas.

State and local governments continue privatizing

Public works, public utilities, and public support activities are increasingly being contracted out at the local level, according to a 1988 study by the International City Management Association.

Democrats and Republicans alike are embracing privatization at the state and local levels as a viable alternative to either cutting services or raising taxes. Among the big-city mayors who have championed at least some privatization initiatives are Tom Bradley (Los Angeles transit and Coliseum), Wilson Goode (Philadelphia refuse collection), Kathy Whitmire (various Houston services), Kenneth Gibson (numerous Newark services), and Terry Goddard (Phoenix public-works services). When it comes to getting the most for the taxpayer's dollar, privatization has now become a mainstream tool of good government.

One of 1988's other notable trends was the continued move toward Build-Operate-Transfer as a means of obtaining new infrastructure. Nearly all of the 65 currently operating resource-recovery (waste-to-energy)

plants are privately funded and/or operated. A growing number of cities and counties are tapping the private sector to obtain new water-supply and sewage-treatment facilities.

National concern over decaying highways and bridges is leading to a resurgence of interest in toll roads. A national conference in November 1988 highlighted the growing number of new public toll-road projects, especially in Colorado, Florida, and Texas—as well as the first such projects in California (in fast-growing Orange County). In a major shift of federal policy, the highway bill approved by Congress in January 1988 offered federal assistance for nine toll road projects—touching off feverish competition among states. The Federal Highway Administration received applications from all over the country. Several projects for private toll roads, on the B-O-T model, are moving forward, particularly the proposed extension of the Dulles Toll Road in Virginia. The first new private toll bridge in over 40 years, opened last June connecting Fargo, North Dakota with Moorhead, Minnesota.

Prison privatization continued to grow in 1988, as well. The greatest activity took place in Texas, where the state contracted for the private construction and operation of four 500-bed minimum-security prisons. All four will be built by Houston-based Becon Corporation; two will then be operated by Wackenhut and two by Corrections Corporation of America. Texas also holds the record for the largest existing prison whose operation has been contracted out. Wackenhut has renovated and now operates the 619-bed Central Texas Correctional Facility for parole violators, in San Antonio.

Another 1988 milestone was the first privatization of a major public housing project. The 464-unit Kenilworth-Parkside project in Washington, DC, was sold by the District government (for $1.00) to the Kenilworth-Parkside Resident Management Corporation. KPRM Corporation has been managing the project successfully since 1982. After a $23-million federally funded renovation is completed in 1990, tenants will be able to purchase a share of the management company for $10,000, which will entitle them to own their own unit. The Department of House & Urban Development under Secretary Jack Kemp sees this project as a model for privatizing other public housing projects by means of tenant management corporations.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleague Representative BYRON DORGAN as cosponsor of a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

The purpose of this bill is to make the internal workings of the Federal Reserve System more accessible to Congress and the public and to improve the coordination of monetary and fiscal policy.

The bill would make a number of changes in the current structure and procedures of the Federal Reserve System:

It would make the Secretary of the Treasury a member of the Federal Open Market Committee, the arm of the Fed that actually sets monetary policy. Currently, the FOMC consists of the 7 members of the Board of Governors, the president of the New York Fed, and 4 of the other 11 Federal Reserve Bank presidents who serve on a rotating basis.

It would make the term of office for the chairman of the Board of Governors coterminous with the term of office of the President of the United States. The term of the current chairman of the Board of Governors, Alan Greenspan, will expire in 1991, during President Bush's third year in office.

It would require that the Fed disclose immediately its policy decisions and any change in the targets of monetary policy. Currently, the Fed waits 6 weeks before releasing information on its monetary policy decisions.

It would permit the Comptroller General to conduct more thorough audits of Federal Reserve operations than can now be conducted.

It would require the Federal Reserve's budget to be published in the budget of the U.S. Government, for the current year and two succeeding years.

The Federal Reserve is currently faced with the very difficult task of trying to slow the economy and prevent inflation from accelerating without causing a recession. It is also trying to bring the dollar to a level where American industry will be competitive in world markets. These are complex goals that the Federal Reserve will not be able to achieve without appropriate help from Congress, the President and the private sector.

This bill is an attempt to strengthen the Fed's ability to conduct monetary policy by improving the structure and procedures of the Federal Reserve, and it deserves a fair hearing. Allowing the Secretary of the Treasury to paricipate in the deliberations of the Federal Open Market Committee, the policymaking arm of the Federal Reserve, and making the term of the Fed chairman coterminous with that of the President will make it easier for the Federal Reserve and the Government to coordinate economic policy.

The bill will also give Congress and the public greater access to information on Federal Reserve policies and the day-to-day operations of the Federal Reserve. Immediate release of policy decisions will increase the efficiency of U.S. capital markets and reduce the uncertainty of investment decisions, since all investors large and small would be given equal and timely information about the goals and policies of the Federal Reserve. GAO audits and publication of th Fed's budget in the annual Budget of the U.S. Government will shed more light on how the Federal Reserve spends money. During the 99th and 100th Congresses, I introduced legislation that would require publication of the Fed's budget for the current year and projections for the two succeeding years, and the bill that Congresman DORGAN and I are introducing today also adopts that approach.

It is our hope that the bill will focus the attention of Congress and the public on how the structure and procedures of the Federal Reserve can be improved. It deserves serious study and I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW CROSS FLORIDA BARGE CANAL LEGISLATION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation, along with my fellow Florida colleagues, EARL HUTTO, BILL MCCOLLUM, and HARRY JOHNSON, to study the area of the new deauthorized Cross Florida Barge Canal for possible inclusion in the National Park System, the Wild and Scenic River System, or the National Forest System. This legislation is in response to a State of Florida request to dispose of the canal land as it sees fit, with a minimal of restrictions. The State's plan is unacceptable because it would allow the land to be sold at the State's will to private concerns, which could result in degradation of those important, environmentally sensitive lands.

Under my bill, which amends the 1986 Water Resources Act, that served to deauthorize the canal, the Department of the Interior, rather than the Corps of Engineers, would provide the needed study—within 6 months—and management plan. With that in hand, hopefully the State will proceed to cooperate with the Federal Government to achieve the environmental protection of these lands. I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my bill along with a copy of the portion of the 1986 act that served to deauthorize the canal.

My bill provides for a real environmental program in that area, and I look forward to early hearings on this in the Committee on Interior.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. CROSS FLORIDA NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) STUDY BY NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.—Section 1114(e)(1) of Public Law 99-662 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a study to determine the eligibility of lands and waters within the Cross Florida National Conservation Area for inclusion within the national park system, the national wild and scenic rivers system, or the national forest system, or any combination of the foregoing. The study shall contain a comprehensive plan for the management of such lands and waters as components of one or more of such national systems. The study under this section shall be carried out in consultation with the State of Florida, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Fish and Wildlife service, and the Secretary of the Army and shall be submitted to the Congress within 6 months after the enactment of this Act.

(b) MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 1114(e)(3) of Public Law 99-662 is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The plan submitted under this subsection shall assign management authorities with respect to the conservation area among the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.".

(c) ADMINISTRATION JURISDICTION.—Section 1114(e)(5) of Public Law 99-662 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) Immediately upon his acquisition of the lands referred to in subsection (g), the Secretary of the Army shall transfer such lands, together with any other lands within the conservation area which are under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or to such other agencies as are designated for such purposes pursuant to the study under this subsection.".

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Paragraph (6) and (7) of Public Law 99-662 are each amended by inserting "of the Interior" after "Secretary" in each place such term appears.

1986 WATER RESOURCES ACT

(a)(1) For the multiple purposes of preserving, enhancing, interpreting, and managing the water and related land resources of an area containing unique cultural, fish and wildlife, scenic, and recreational values and for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations and the development of outdoor recreation, there is hereby established the Cross Florida National Conservation Area (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Conservation Area").

(2) The Conservation Area shall consist of all lands and interests in lands held by the Secretary for the high-level barge canal project from the Saint Johns River across the State of Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized by the Act of July 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 703) (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "barge canal project"), all lands and interests in lands held by the State of Florida or the Canal Authority of such State for such project, and all lands and interests in lands held by such State or such Canal Authority and acquired pursuant to section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960.

(3) Within the Conservation Area there is hereby designated the Conservation Management Area which shall consist of all lands and interests in lands held by the Secretary within that portion of the barge canal project that is located between the Eureka Lock and Dam and the Inglis Lock and Dam (exclusive of such structures), plus all lands and interests in lands held by the Canal Authority of the State of Florida between such structures and all lands and interests in lands held by such State of Canal Authority and acquired pursuant to section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960.

(b) Those portions of the barge canal project located between the Gulf of Mexico and the Inglis project structures and located between the Atlantic Ocean and the Eureka Lock and Dam, inclusive, shall be operated and maintained by the Secretary for the purposes of navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement and for the benefit of the economy of the region.

(c) In order to further the purposes set forth in paragraph (a)(1) of this section, that portion of the barge canal project located between the Eureka Lock and Dam and the Inglis Lock and Dam (exclusive of such structures) is not authorized for the purposes described in the Act of July 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 703) after the date this subsection becomes effective.

(d) The State of Florida shall retain jurisdiction and responsibility over water resources planning, development, and control of the surface and ground waters pertaining to lands cited in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, except to the extent that any uses of such water resources would be inconsistent with the purposes of this section.

(e)(1) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the United States Forest Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State of Florida, shall develop and transmit to Congress a comprehensive management plan for lands (including water areas) located within the Conservation Management Area.

(2) Such plan shall, at a minimum, provide for—

(A) enhancement of the environment;

(B) conservation and development of natural resources;

(C) conservation and preservation of fish and wildlife;

(D) preservation of scenic and enhancing recreational values;

(E) a procedure for the prompt consideration of applications for easements across Conservation Management Area lands, when such easements are requested by local or State governmental jurisdictions or by a regulated public utility for a public purpose; and

(F) preservation and enhancement of water resources and water quality, including groundwater.

(3) Such plan shall establish, among the Secretary, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the State of Florida, the responsibilities for implementation of such plan.

(4) Until transmittal of such plan to Congress, the Secretary shall operate, maintain, and manage the lands and facilities held by the Secretary under the terms of subsection (c).

(5) Upon submission of such plan to Congress, the Secretary and other agencies, pursuant to the agreement under paragraph (3) of this subsection, are authorized to implement such plan.

(6) The Secretary shall transmit recommendations for protecting and enhancing the values of the Conservation Area to Congress together with such plan.

(7) The Secretary shall consult and cooperate with other departments and agencies of the United States and the State of Florida in the development of measures and programs to protect and enhance water resources and water quality with the Conservation Area.

(f) The Secretary shall operate the Rodman Dam, authorized by the Act of July 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 703), in a manner which will assure the continuation of the reservoir known as Lake Ocklawaha. The Secretary shall not operate the Eureka Lock and Dam in a manner which would create a reservoir on lands not flooded on January 1, 1984.

(g)(1) As soon as possible, the Secretary shall acquire, for the sum of $32,000,000, all lands and interests in lands held on the date of the enactment of this Act by the Canal Authority of the State of Florida for the purposes of the barge canal project. In the event the sums available to the Secretary in any fiscal year are insufficient to purchase all such lands and interests, the State of Florida shall transfer to the Secretary that percentage of the total number of acres to be transferred that is proportionate to the sums received by the State compared with $32,000,000.

(2) From amounts received under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Canal Authority shall forthwith make payments to the Florida counties of Duval, Clay, Putnam, Marion, Levy, and Citrus. Such payments shall, in the aggregate, be equal to $32,000,000. The amount of payment under this paragraph to each such county shall be determined by multiplying such aggregate amount by the amount of ad valorem taxes paid to the Cross Florida Canal Navigation District by such county and dividing such product by the amount of such taxes paid by all such counties.

(3) As soon as possible, the State of Florida shall transfer to the Secretary all lands and interests in lands held by the State of Florida or the Canal Authority of such State and acquired pursuant to section 104 of the river and Harbor Act of 1960.

(b) Subsection (c) shall become effective—

(1) 90 days after the Governor of Florida has certified to the Secretary that the State has met the conditions set out in subsection (i) of this section, unless the Secretary determines within such period that the State has failed to comply with such conditions; or

(2) on the date of the final order in a declaratory judgment action, brought by the State of Florida in a Federal District Court within Florida, finding that the State has met the conditions.

(i) Subsection (c) shall not become effective until the State of Florida enacts a law or laws which assure that—

(1) on and after the date on which construction of the portion of the barge canal project referred to in subsection (c) is no longer authorized, all lands and interests in lands held for the project by the State of Florida or the Canal Authority of such State will continue to be held by such State or canal authority pending transfer to the Secretary, as provided in this section; and

(2) on and after such date, all lands and interests in lands held by the State of Florida or the Canal Authority of such State and acquired pursuant to section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 will continue to be held by such State or Canal Authority, pending transfer to the Secretary as provided in this section;

(3) on and after such date, the State of Florida will never transfer to any person (except the Federal Government) any lands owned by such State or the Canal Authority of such State (except existing State roads, highways, and bridges and related rights-of-way, which may be transferred to a county or other local government) and contained within the expanded boundary of the Ocala National Forest as proposed and shown on the map dated July 1978, on file with the Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, District of Columbia; and

(4) the State of Florida enacts a law which assures that, on and after such date, the interests in the lands described in paragraph (1) held by the State of Florida are sufficient to carry out the purposes of this section.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO DEWEY H. SMITH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and pay tribute to an outstanding individual

and a tireless public servant. Dewey H. Smith will be honored June 30, 1989, as he completes his term as president of the Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce. This occasion gives me the opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for his many years of hard work and unending commitment to the betterment of the greater Lakewood area.

Dewey Smith, born in Decatur, GA, attended Rollins College and Long Beach State University in my own congressional district. He has also served his country in the military, having been in the Navy from 1952 to 1955.

Dewey is currently manager of community relations at Douglas Aircraft Co., a division of McDonnell Douglas Corp. in Long Beach, CA, a position he has held since 1985. While with McDonnell Douglas since 1962, he has held several positions. These include producer-director of documentary films for Douglas in Santa Monica, and also administrator for the film and TV communications department of the aircraft division. In this later position, he produced and supervised the production of all documentary films for the aircraft division. He was manager of photographic and audio visual services, as well as manager of product promotion and marketing communications.

Dewey's positions as producer-director of documentary films for Douglas in Santa Monica, and as supervisor of photography for the high altitude nuclear tests at Johnston Island are testament to his photographic skill. This is further born out by his more than 6 years at Cape Canaveral, as photographic coordinator for Douglas, and also as coordinator and supervisor with several companies while there at the Cape.

In addition to his professional achievements, Dewey has a record of untiring public service. Along with the Greater Lakewood Chamber of Commerce, he is president of the Douglas Historical Foundation, the McDonnell Douglas Project Love Foundation, the Long Beach Industry Education Council, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He is also the past president of the Douglas Aircraft Company Management Club, the executive vice president of the Los Angeles USO, vice chairman of the Long Beach Chamber of Commerce, and served on the advisory board of AIESEC in Long Beach, and on the board of Governors of the Doctors Hospital of Lakewood.

And, if you can believe that he still has time, Dewey also sits on the board of directors of the Long Beach Conservation Corps, St. Mary's Foundation board, American Cancer Society, Cities in Schools, the Boy Scouts of America, and DARE. He even is chairman of the Lakewood community fair/chili cook-off, one of my favorite events in the area.

And, somehow in his busy schedule, Dewey found time to marry the former Joan Page in 1985. His family now includes his stepchildren, Cinde Brown, Tami Sacks, and Gordie Page.

My wife, Lee, joins me in extending our congratulations to Dewey H. Smith, and his lovely wife and family. He is truly a remarkable individual who has devoted his talents and energies to enriching the lives of so many others. On behalf of the greater Lakewood area, we wish Dewey, his wife and their children, all the best in the years to come.

FLAG DECISION A SLAP IN THE FACE OF AMERICAN CITIZENS

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join President Bush and many of my colleagues in calling for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that will prohibit the desecration of the flag of the United States. I have introduced legislation, House Joint Resolution 336, which will prohibit any individual from publicly mutilating, defacing, defiling, or in any other way desecrating the flag of the United States. My legislation will afford the people of this country the opportunity to restore the flag to its unique position as a symbol of our Nation and the values it stands for.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the Supreme Court ruled last week, by a bare 5–4 majority, that the burning of our flag as a political protest should be protected as a form of free speech. Mr. Speaker, I find this ruling to be most unfortunate and an erroneous interpretation of what our forefathers, and we as a people, define as free speech. Supreme Court Chief Justice William Rehnquist said in his dissenting opinion: "Surely one of the high purposes of a democratic society is to legislate against conduct that is regarded as evil and profoundly offensive to the majority of people." Undoubtedly, the public outrage sparked during the past week by the Court's decision, marks the fact that the decision is offensive to the majority of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the ruling serves as a slap in the face to the millions of American citizens who have fought to protect and support the flag and all that it stands for, be that on a battlefield, or on a playing field at the Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, here in our Nation's Capital we are surrounded by numerous memorials dedicated to those brave men who gave up their lives in defense of freedom and democracy. For these fallen heroes, the American flag was a unique symbol of the values which they sacrificed their lives to preserve. It is a sad day indeed when those who continue to benefit from the actions of such heroes should now claim a right to publicly burn and desecrate with contempt our flag.

Mr. Speaker, this decision is an outrage, especially to those women whose only emblem of their son's or husband's supreme sacrifice may be a neatly folded flag, presented to them at their loved one's funeral.

My colleagues, if you look out from the Capitol toward the Mall, you can see thousands of people visiting the Smithsonian Institution daily, to view the inventions and triumphs that make our Nation great. One of the largest attractions is indeed the Star-Spangled Banner, the flag which inspired Francis Scott Key to write our national anthem, an image of a banner resilient in the face of flame.

This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker, rather, it is an American issue. We, as representatives of the people of this Nation, should not allow this decision to serve as a detrimental blow, as well as an embarrassment, to our constituents' pride and patriotism.

How can we expect the United States of America to remain an example of freedom, unity, and loyalty to the entire world when our flag, the symbol that has served as a common denominator through our Nation's hardest times, is allowed, by law, to be publicly reduced to ashes?

Mr. Speaker, one of the first things our children learn as they enter grade school is reverence for the flag of the United States. They learn the Pledge of Allegiance, and the significance of the Stars and Stripes, as well as the story of Betsy Ross. I ask you how public displays of flag burning will affect their view of our country? Is this the type of idea we want to instill in our young people?

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of my colleagues to please consider supporting House Joint Resolution 336, and every other effort to overturn this tragic decision by the Supreme Court. I will not be satisfied until the flag of the United States regains the respect and protection which it so clearly deserves.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY BROADCAST SCRIPTWRITING CONTEST WINNER FROM RAYNE, LA

HON. JAMES A. HAYES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my honor and privilege to present to the House an essay written by a constituent of mine, Reneé Desiree Brown. Miss Brown was one of 250,000 secondary school students who participated in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary annual broadcast scriptwriting contest. I believe that once you hear Miss Brown's essay you too will understand why she was chosen as the contestant winner for the State of Louisiana. I believe that such programs as the Voice of Democracy present an excellent opportunity for our youth to become involved in both recognizing and developing solutions to America's problems.

PREPARING FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Reneé D. Brown)

As the sun slowly peaks over the horizon a squirrel climbs an oak tree to collect acorns for winter. Across the globe a family in Japan sits together reading to their children. In Iran children fall asleep to the sound of artillery—no future in sight. Here in America a child when waking finds no parent, coming home from school again—no one. Notice: the squirrel stored acorns—nothing else. The Japanese family sat together. The Iranian children had no clothes or food but did know the true meaning of life—and death. Our children have abundant acorns, but they still hunger.

Out of a third story window a graying businessman stares—dreaming of what is beyond the horizon. Just out of sight on the street below lay homeless hungry children. Through the successful man's mind run the projections of America's tomorrow. He hears of children—roaming the streets looking for a good time. Yet, he is so high up he

cannot see them—cannot look into the eyes—cannot feel the desire—cannot hear the cry of confusion. In his preparation for the future he reads the statistics, not the children. Staring ahead to the future is not the answer but the dilemma. For that mans and our dreams to be fulfilled we must wake up, face the unpleasantness that is there—and see the children. They hold our destiny—what footsteps should a child follow in present day America?

They see a nation not ready to begin preparation for tomorrow. We must first decide what we wish to be. Will we continue striving to be the number one world power through pointing guns or the first nation with the courage to reroute money going to build arms and build our children instead?

Second, every strong civilization since the beginning of time, including our own, trusted and thanked God. Who leads America now? With no prayer anywhere—how hypercritical is it to even suggest "In God We Trust". The setting of morals cannot be recited as laws for the entire nation, instead the return of family, and faith must begin in each individual home.

Third, leaders. Where are they? Our children have seen a mini-war of name-calling throughout, not a horse race, but the presidential race. Who do the candidates favor? Hispanics? Women? Abortionists? Blacks? Hey, are these not all Americans? Why focus on international affairs? We hear war games daily—not at the local video arcade—but on the 6 o'clock news. We cannot yell PEACE loudly in election year, then sell arms to warring nations when times get tough. The future is an unknown world limited only by ourselves. Let's put no limits on our young, but show truth and honesty through our leaders actions today. Covering up the past and hiding from the press must stop on the local, state, and national level. Role models may be the link missing in the chain connecting us to our tomorrow.

Fourth, unity. High above the clouds in an airplane you will see everything learned in geography is not correct. When you leave one state and go into the next there is no line. There are borders separating houses, but no border between states. Therefore, there can be no Texans, or New Yorkers, or Californians—only American. Unity among our states will be the initial step in uniting the entire globe, and spur the realization that every human, regardless of nationality, faces problems that know no boundaries.

As the sun lowers, the squirrel snuggles comfortably in his nest. He fears no storm, no winter, for he has sufficient and appropriate acorns. Let's learn from the squirrel—he did not store flowers for luxury, rocks for defense, nor did he fret whether the sun would rise tomorrow, he completed today. To prepare for the future we must mend the injuries of the present and past, face our fears, with fear there comes courage and, with that courage, bound together, press into tomorrow. The voice of Democracy should not cry out words to tickle the ears and send chills down America's spine, but show truth, that is democracy. As individual children with our own abilities, alone, we cannot hope to succeed, with the nation bound todgether as one behind us, we cannot fail. If I have caused one person to stop one moment to reflect the memory of a child, and realize in the gleam found in those eyes you see tomorrow, and you now see that gleam must not fade, I have succeeded.

A RESUME OF THE VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

The program was started 41 years ago with the endorsement of the United States Office of Education and, National Association of Broadcasters, Electronic Industries Association and State Association of Broadcasters. Starting in 1958-59, the program was conducted in cooperation with the Veterans of Foreign Wars with the broadcasters still serving as sponsors.

In 1961-62, the Veterans of Foreign Wars assumed sole sponsorship responsibility. At that time, the National scholarship award consisted of a single $1,500 scholarship for the first place national winner.

During the past 28 years under VFW sponsorship, the annual national scholarships have been increased to nine, totaling $42,500 with the first place winner currently receiving a $16,000 scholarship to the college of their choice. Student participation has tripled and school participations has doubled.

This past year more than one-quarter million students participated. Over 6,000 schools participated, over 4,000 VFW Posts and 3,700 Ladies Auxiliaries sponsored the program and over 2,000 radio and TV stations cooperated.

The total monetary value of scholarships and awards provided by VFW Posts, Auxiliaries, Districts and Departments amounted to over one million dollars last year. This is in addition to the $42,500 in national scholarships and an annual budget at the national level in excess of $150,000 to conduct the Voice of Democracy Program.

During the 28 years of sponsorship by the VFW, over six million students have participated and awards totaling more than six million have been given to winners at all levels in scholarships, savings bonds, etc.

OUTLAW FLAG BURNING

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said about the greatest symbol of our Nation and our freedoms—the U.S. flag. I am as proud as every American to see our flag fly proudly over every town and city in our country.

I have an editorial that reflects well my feelings on the American flag and the recent Supreme Court decision to permit the burning of the flag. I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Don Gordon of the Florence Morning News for putting in writing what so many of us feel.

[From the Florence Morning News, June 29, 1989]

OUTLAW FLAG BURNING

Americans are free to criticize their government in the strongest terms, to denounce public officials by name, to picket in front of the White House, City Hall or anywhere else and to participate fully in a political process by which change in public policy might be wrought.

In short, little is denied citizens in the way of freedom of expression. The Constitution guarantees this, for which we can all be thankful.

But for some, that is not enough. Contempt for country runs so hot in a few of our citizens that they believe they must make an ultimate demonstration of that contempt. So they choose the American Flag as the target. They trample it, they wear it on the seat of their pants and they burn it.

And now five members of the U.S Supreme Court say this activity must be allowed as an exercise of free speech, despite many state laws to the contrary.

To say that opinion did not play well across the land is an understatement of the first order. It was not popular in Florence, South Carolina, and apparently it was not popular anywhere else.

Should that make a difference? Should the law of the land be a matter of popular consensus? In some cases, yes. In this case, yes. The majority controlling in the present instance is of nine individuals. But ultimately, if we are to have truly representative government and if the law is to have the respect it deserves, it must be supported by most of the people who have to live by it. The "law" as enunciated by the 5-4 Supreme Court decision clearly does not meet that test.

If the vast majority of Americans do not believe anyone should have the right to desecrate the American Flag—can there be any doubt on that point?—then that's the way it ought to be. President Bush had it right when he called the flag "a unique national symbol." Setting it apart from all other avenues of expression would not, in the opinion of this newspaper, do violence to the First Amendment or to the rights of those in our midst who have something to say.

Conversely, failure to allow the flag special protective status is an affront against the American people as a whole. Burning the flag is different from speech. The flag is tangible; it represents values and a way of life that are precious to most Americans. Its desecration is an outrage. In a real sense, it hurts in a way that spoken or written words cannot.

Let us not confuse flag-burners with mere political dissenters, citizens with grievances against government or with reformers who hope to make society better.

The flag does not represent government; it stands for the Republic and those who stomp on it are demonstrating their hatred for country and a contempt for the sacrifices that were necessary to keep it free.

Those individuals remain perfectly free under the First Amendment to spray their verbal venom in any public square they choose. They would lose nothing in terms of freedom of expression if they had to stop short of abusing the flag.

For that reason, we support the president in his call for a constitutional amendment to outlaw flag desecration.

While that course may seem extreme, it is the only one open if the law of the land is to be truly reflective of the national consensus.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE ESSAY CONTEST WINNER MISS LISA C. ORR OF MORGANTOWN, WV

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, when the Honorable Jennings Randolph retired in 1984, he had represented the great State of West Virginia since 1933, first in the House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate, for a total of 51 years.

Beginning in 1945, then Representative Jennings Randolph introduced legislation to create a cabinet level Department of Peace. He did so at the same time that the United Nations was chartered in San Francisco in that same year.

While he believed in the creation of the UN, and had faith in its future usefulness in allowing nations to come together to debate and discuss their differences in an effort to avoid future confrontations and conflicts around the globe, he was not at all certain that establishing the United Nations was all we needed to do to assure there would not be another "Great War."

Why? Because in 1945, at the end of World War II, even though the United Nations was established with great fanfare, good intentions, and hope for the future, the United States still had a Department of War. Later, in 1948, it became the Department of Defense. But that was then, and in all the ensuing years of Jennings Randolph's career in the Congress, he tenaciously continued to introduce legislation to create a "peace arm" of the United States Government.

In 1948, in the wee hours of the morning while he stood watch from a small room in the Nation's Capitol, where nearby a Senate-House conference was in session, Senator Jennings Randolph witnessed the authorization for the establishment of the United States Institute of Peace adopted at last, as an amendment to, of all things, the Department of Defense authorization bill.

Today, Senator Randolph serves proudly as the Peace Institute's senior advisor and, even though he is no longer taking an active part in the institute's work, there is nothing that pleases him more than the institute's conduct of the annual peace essay contest among high school students throughout the Nation.

During the month of June of this year, the Peace Institute's Second Annual National Peace Essay contest winners were brought forth from their communities to represent their States, to be feted in Washington, DC., to visit the institute and meet its officials and scholars, to meet one another, to discuss among themselves their winning essays, and to visit the seat of the Capital of the greatest free Nation in the world, the United States of America.

Briefly, I would like to describe the institute's essay contest. Each participant is asked to write an essay of no more than 1,500 words on the topic provided by the institute. To become contestants, each participant must first publish their entries in official high school publications, which allows them to share their ideas with their peers, as as well as the Institute.

There are more than 150 college scholarship awards for State and national winners of the contest each year.

Each essay winner is presented with a "Year Book" which contains all of the winning essays nationwide, and I highly recommend it to my colleagues, so that you will get the feel for what your young constituents think about, and what they believe to be true with regard to this country's peace-keeping efforts. For information concerning your state winner, Members of Congress may contact the Essay Project Director at the Institute, Ms. Nan Kyle, by calling her at 457-1700, or write to her in care of the U.S. Institute of Peace, 1550 M Street, NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC. You may order the yearbook for the 1988-89 essay contest, or simply ask for a copy of the essay by the winning contestant from your State. I believe you will be pleased with the work of your young constituents, and you may wish to congratulate them for their efforts.

This year, the students were asked to write on the topic of the 1975 Helsinki accords, signed by 35 nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union. This document asserts the principle that universal respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms, and self-determination is crucial for the development of friendly relations and cooperation among all states of the world.

Within this context, entrants were asked to analyze the significance of the Helsinki accords as a step toward world peace.

This year's winner from West Virginia was Ms. Lisa C. Orr of Morgantown High School, Morgantown, WV. The topic of her essay was: "The Helsinki Agreement: Accordance or Dissonance?"

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Lisa on her winning essay, and to ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted immediately hereafter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT: ACCORDANCE OR DISSONANCE?

The "Helsinki Accords," a mutual agreement for peace and cooperation in Europe signed by 35 nations in 1975, delineates many positive ideas for the world such as peace, security, and cooperation. Unfortunately, because of unrealistic and unenforceable restraints on military action and occupation as well as unclear definition of those terms, it is easily ignored and hopelessly unenforceable by the participating states. Due to heightening tensions among world powers following the signing of the "Accords," most noticeably those between the United States and the Soviet Union, the "Helsinki Accords" were not a step towards world peace.

In July of 1975, the "Helsinki Accords" were signed and put into effect by the participating states at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Less than a year later the Soviets made their first breach of the agreement by invading Afghanistan. In that single incident the USSR violated at least three articles of the "Accords."

In the article title "Refraining from the threat or use of force," it states that "the participating states will refrain in their mutual relations, as well as their international relations in general, from the threat or use of force. . . ." Soviet action clearly contradicts this idea—the Soviets had little or no intention of living up to their part of the bargain. "Peaceful settlement of disputes"—the second "ignored" resolution—discusses using peaceful solutions to resolve disputes following the guidelines of the United Nations. Lastly, the article titled "Territorial integrity of States" without question shows the "Accords" position on military occupation: ". . . No such occupation or acquisition will be recognized as legal."

How do the Soviets combat these accusations? Strangely enough by using the same fiction used by the U.S. during the Vietnam War. The USSR claims that their presence in Afghanistan was welcomed—that they were invited into the country just as the U.S. was invited into Vietnam. The only relevant difference between the situations is that the U.S. had no prior interest in Vietnam, a country thousands of miles away. The USSR, on the other hand, historically has had a significant influence on the Afghans and interest in the country because of the proximity of the two nations. The recent decision of the USSR to pull out of Afghanistan, and the U.S. pullout of Vietnam, show the weakness of this argument. The situation in that area of the world has not improved because of Soviet occupation, the people of Afghanistan want the Soviets out—the fairy tale invitation was revoked, their welcome worn out.

The Soviets also have reputedly implemented a political strategy called "divide et impera." This divide and conquer policy is used to "sow discord among the allies as well as within each allied country by inflaming antagonisms and arousing mutual suspicions, using for their purpose political, military and economic inducements or punishments, as the situation requires," according to Richard Pipes, author of "Survival is Not Enough: Soviet Realities and America's Future." Mr. Pipes goes on to say that the USSR pressures the West into mutual agreements accords, such as those signed at Helsinki, to create the illusion that "It shares with the U.S. responsibility for safeguarding the peace and integrity of the Continent [Europe] as a whole, thereby undermining NATO and pushing Western Europe towards neutralism." If these ideas did influence the Conference at Helsinki, the original concept of the "Accords" was heartlessly and purposely overshadowed by the USSR's prior intention.

Whether or not the USSR still practices this policy is still under debate. Although Gorbachev gives the impression that Soviet and Communist party attitudes are changing, those remaining skeptical of the USSR point out the incident in which Gorbachev ignored the tenth anniversary of the "Helsinki Accords." The "Helsinki Accords" have many provisions concerning the development and exchange of information, yet nothing contradicted these resolutions more than the jamming of BBC broadcasts. This situation gave Gorbachev a perfect opportunity for a liberal gesture displaying his commitment to the "Accords," but he declined—continuing the annoyance for people both inside the Soviet Union and out because of the noise interference in other shortwave broadcasts. Moreover, the special transmitters that do the job cost the USSR an enormous amount of money. Although the jamming has been lifted now, twelve years after the signing of the "Accords" and three years after its tenth anniversary, this

"policy of paranoia" was yet another shortcoming of the Soviets and the Helsinki Agreement.

The question surrounding the Olympic Games of 1980 also present evidence of the downfalls of the Helsinki agreement. In 1980, President Carter boycotted the games in protest of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan mentioned earlier. This in itself was not a step towards world peace, but because it was to show disapproval of a greater wrong one must examine which nation was really the cause of discord. It seems obvious that the Soviet Union was at greater fault than the United States because their original actions were those that initiated the difficulties.

Because of these discrepancies, the Accords cause innumerable disagreements in interpretation when applied to the touchiest areas of foreign policy. Perhaps agreements such as these should be restricted in some manner to keep them from inflaming the very tensions that they were created to relieve. It is unfortunate that this type of agreement isn't more effective, but like the League of Nations, it failed due to lack of ability to enforce—individual participating states can't be expected to play babysitter for one another.

Communication is the key to understanding and peace, but agreements such as those made at Helsinki are simply ineffective in many areas—their compliance can only be strongly urged. The conference itself was important—differences were aired, ideas discussed, and compromises contemplated, but in the struggle to create a concrete document to show the world its success the participating super powers compromised past their independent, preconceived, and self-imposed boundaries—allowing breaches and discord once again.

MUSIC, FAITH HELP BATTLE ADVERSITY

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert the attached newspaper clipping from the May 22 edition of the Union City Daily Leader in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This article is about an extraordinary young woman in my congressional district, Mrs. Telia Hall, who has overcome personal adversity and turned her life into a new direction to benefit her fellowman. Mrs. Hall was a licensed practical nurse until she was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis in 1987. She truly loved her profession—an area in which she could use her abilities to help those in need.

It was a blow to her to have to give up the nursing profession she dearly loved. However, Telia did not sit around and feel sorry for herself. She began directing her energies into songwriting. She has written a song dedicated to the nursing profession and is in the process of writing more songs in praise to God.

Mrs. Hall is an example to us all and I want to share her story with my colleagues.

MUSIC, FAITH HELP BATTLE ADVERSITY

(By Chris Hatley)

A hand-crafted angel stands gracefully on the piano as 30-year-old Mrs. Telia Hall softly sings her tribute to nurses everywhere.

"Let temperance and meekness operate completely in you; Look unto God for wisdom to flow through you," Mrs. Hall sings.

Just as Mrs. Hall, herself a former licensed practical nurse, asks nurses to look to God for guidance, she has also turned to God for the words to her song, "Angels of Mercy."

Mrs. Hall, who lives near Woodland Mills with her husband, was forced to leave her beloved nursing profession when it was discovered she suffers from multiple sclerosis. She learned in 1987 that she has MS, a degenerative disease of the central nervous system that results in the hardening of tissue.

Mrs. Hall, who tires easily and often suffers from muscle soreness, misses nursing a great deal, but now devotes much of her time to singing, playing piano and writing songs.

"I prayed about it," says Mrs. Hall, who has always enjoyed singing. "The Lord began to give me this song about nurses and what is expected of them.

"I want to dedicate this song to all the nurses in the area," the singer says, noting that May 2 marked the observance of National Nurses Day. "When you write songs, it's a God given talent. That's the way I think about it."

With the help of Union City attorney John Warner, Mrs. Hall's musical tribute to nursing has been copyrighted through the Library of Congress in Washington, DC.

"He (Warner) was real encouraging. He told me I ought to frame my certificates from all my songs I have copyrighted," Mrs. Hall says.

With one song completed, Mrs. Hall is working on her second, a gospel tune entitled "Rejoice in the Lord." She says four friends, Ken and Debbie Asher of the group Harmony and Wayne and Judy Posey, encouraged her to pursue her musical interests.

"He (Ken Asher) felt there would be some interest in my music," Mrs. Hall says. "You have to have a little bit of encouragement.

"Once you have your whole life completely changed, your self-esteem is really low. I've been trying to build my confidence. I purposed in my heart, through the help of the Lord, that I was going to share a part of my life," she adds.

Mrs. Hall says she looks to God for strength.

"Prayer has become a special part of my everyday routine," she says. "A lot of times I've been given words or tunes while praying."

Mrs. Hall's husband, Mike, who works the second shift at Goodyear, is also very supportive.

"He encourages me," Mrs. Hall says. "But with him working second shift, I've had to learn to be independent."

Mrs. Hall says she sometimes suffers muscle spasms, "but I've come a long way."

She uses a walker, but says optimistically, "For me to walk, that's a big accomplishment."

"I have a lot to be thankful for. I don't take anything for granted," she says. "Every day's a battle. But when you stop and look, there's always somebody worse off than you are. Just look to the Lord and go wherever he leads you.

"I sing, I write songs, I play piano. The doctors told me I'd never do any of that. My speech therapist is astonished.

"I'm a miracle," Mrs. Hall adds with an angelic smile.

ALCOHOL- AND DRUG-FREE GRADUATION PARTIES A SUCCESS AT AREA HIGH SCHOOLS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House all the individuals in northern Virginia who have participated and contributed to the overwhelming success of all-night graduation parties, free of alcohol and drugs, held in area schools.

Area parents, business leaders, teachers, principals, students, and community leaders have for the third year ensured the success of these all-night graduation parties through contributions, prizes, and extensive planning.

I commend the students, parent coordinators, and everyone who in some way participated in or planned the high school all-night graduation parties. The student representatives and their high schools are: Stephanie Aungst, Annandale; Brian Solan, Bishop O'Connell; Kim Lawrence, Broad Run; Michelle Cyran, Chantilly; Diane Pham, Edison; Tracy Wilcox, Fairfax; Cynthia Southworth, Falls Church; Deanna Byrd, George Mason; Sean Gray, Hayfield; Christine Ellington, Herndon; Rachel Collins, Lake Braddock; Karen Schaben, Langley; Kerri Griffith, Lee; Sandra Moles, Loudoun County; Scott Crane, Loudoun Valley; Cindy Meadows, Madison; Lawrence Frye, Marshall; Kristine Fissell, McLean; Brad Williamson, Mount Vernon; Steve Finch, Oakton; Joe Harris, Osbourne Park; Mark Macislinski, Parkview; Priscilla Demeo, Paul VI; Rebecca Klein, Robinson; Courtney Tolman, South Lakes; Judy Tallant, J.E.B. Stuart; Rachel Webb, T.C. Williams; Douglas Beasley, Thomas Jefferson; Teresa Thomas, Wakefield; Stephanie Shank, Washington and Lee; Robert Johnson, West Potomac; Anne Seinwall, West Springfield; Andrew Stanley, Woodbridge; J.R. Myers, Woodson; and Steve Torregrova, Yorktown.

I also congratulate and recognize the parent coordinators who have contributed so overwhelmingly to the success of these parties. The parent coordinators are: Charlene Foley, coordinator of area parents; Marilyn Weigel, Annandale High; Al Birch, Claudia Gillen, and Barbara Fischi, Bishop O'Connel High; Holly Henrickson and Wayne Griffith, Broad Run High; Jamie McKeever and Hilary Panning, Chantilly High; Lee Rhoads and Ruth Ann Thrift, Edison High; Janice Miller, Fairfax High; Margie Dugan, Falls Church High; Cricket Moore and George Thoms, George Mason High; Betty Vickers and Donna Grigsby, Hayfield High; Bill Torpey, Herndon High; Judy and Bill Paseur, Lake Braddock High; Jane Pope, Langley High; Kathy Cahill, Lee High; Tom Horne and Kenneth Culbert, Loudoun County High; Susan Williams and Gerald Shipp, Loudoun Valley High; Louise Heidner and Doty Lawter, Madison High; Barbara Brooks, Marshall High; Joan Durman, McLean High, Hope Wilson, Paula Johnson and Ann

Ojalehto, Mount Vernon High; Kathy Jones, Oakton High; Rick Van Winkle, Osbourne Park High; Richard Bonieske, Julia Stewart and Carlene McCarty, Parkview High; Father Donald Heet and Louise Saylor, Paul VI; Mary and D'Arcy Roper, William Jackson, and Mimi Doan, Robinson High; Sharon Murphy, South Lakes High; T.J. Glauthier, J.E.B. Stuart High; Judy Felt and John Porter, T.C. Williams High; Janet Harfood and Norren McCafferty, Thomas Jefferson High; Marie Shiels Ojouadi, Cachita Mitchell and Barbara Phillips, Wakefield High; Sue Harrison and Dr. William Sharbaugh, Washington and Lee High; Mary Tueting and Alice Sontag, West Potomac High; Claudia Kiely, West Springfield; Chuck Milheiser, Woodbridge High; Karen Mumford, Woodson High; and Martha Smith and Mark Frankel, Yorktown High.

The alcohol- and drug-free graduation parties these individuals participated in are model efforts in the battle against drugs. These parties serve not only to provide safe and memorable graduation celebrations, they show that we can all have a great time without using alcohol or other substances in social situations. When one life is saved, or one serious injury avoided through participation in these parties, then these seniors know they have succeeded.

Northern Virginia has started a very positive tradition and I am proud to have been a part of the all-night graduation parties both this and last year. This year's graduation celebrations have ended safely and I congratulate all those who attended and planned these parties.

1990 FARM BILL

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, recently I testified before the House Agriculture Committee on a most important issue to Wisconsin farmer—the 1990 farm bill. I want to briefly share with my colleagues a summary of my remarks before the committee.

June is National Dairy Month, and it is appropriate that at today's hearing we discuss several of the issues confronting the future success of the dairy industry. In my view, there are three key issues:

First, reform of the milk marketing order system to ensure regional equality,

Second, continuing programs to encourage farm exports, and

Third, maintaining a market-oriented dairy price support program.

Recently, I held a meeting with 25 members of my agriculture advisory committee to discuss their views on current farm policy. The No. 1 issue of concern to these farmers was the milk marketing order system. Specifically, my farm advisers endorsed the goal of regional equality and fairness in calculating the milk marketing orders.

I. MILK MARKETING ORDER REFORM

Milk marketing orders were established in 1933 to safeguard dairy farmers and consumers from great swings in milk supplies and prices. This was a good approach at that time, since milk was an extremely perishable, bulky commodity, and preservation technologies were primitive.

Today, everything has changed in the dairy industry. Refrigeration technology and pasteurization techniques have improved the shelf life of milk. There is no need to give certain regions of the country incentives to produce more milk. Today, all areas of the country can produce low-cost milk.

Under the current milk marketing order system, farmers in Wisconsin receive the Minnesota-Wisconsin base price which is calculated at Eau Claire, WI. Transportation differentials are then factored in. Consequently, the further a dairy farmer is located from Eau Claire, the higher price he received for his milk.

Wisconsin farmers have a tough time rationalizing how a producer in southeastern Florida can receive upward of $3 per hundredweight more for his milk than a farmer in the upper Midwest. Granted, production costs are higher in the South, but certainly not by $3 per hundredweight.

As a first step toward eliminating the inadequacies of the milk marketing order system, I introduced H.R. 501, the Milk Marketing Reform Act of 1989. The goal of my legislation is to simply bring market competition and equality among the regions back into the milk marketing order system. My bill would require the USDA to designate four to eight regional basing points or natural collection points where the price of milk may be calculated.

Under my bill, the national price paid for milk will be the same at each of the base points. New transportation differentials will be created within the regions to reflect more accurately the costs of moving milk to and from the region's base point.

As the dairy industry enters the 1990's, the impetus should be on allowing the price of milk to be governed by fair market forces. Restrictions on the transportation of milk in any form between the regions should be lifted and all regions of the country should be brought into the milk order system. If an area of the country is going to take advantage of the Federal dairy programs, then participation in the order system should be mandatory.

The milk marketing order system was created during the New Deal era and I believe it's time dairy marketing was brought up to date.

II. FARM EXPORTS

When Congress considered the 1985 farm bill, special attention was devoted to expanding farm exports. It is the export provisions of the 1985 farm bill that have helped fuel the farm recovery of the past few years. After farm export levels plunged to a low of $26.3 billion in 1986, the past 2 years have witnessed a steady rebound. Farm export sales reached $35.5 billion in 1988 and the Department of Agriculture predicts that farm exports will top $37 billion in 1989.

The export programs of the 1985 farm bill have helped the United States compete in international markets, and I strongly encourage reauthorization of these important programs, specifically the export enhancement program [EEP] and the targeted export assistance program [TEA]. These two programs have helped recapture old markets and open many new markets that have traditionally been closed to U.S. agriculture products.

III. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

Finally, I would like to express my support for the continuation of a market-oriented dairy price support program. The National Dairy Commission, an 18-member commission set up by the 1985 farm bill, issued its recommendations last year. The message—the dairy industry should first and foremost rely on price to balance the market.

Wisconsin dairy farmers simply want a fair return for their product. They can compete favorably with other regions of the country and in international markets. If changes are made to realistically reform the milk marketing order system and the emphasis on exports continues, then Wisconsin farmers will receive an equitable market price for their product.

Wisconsin farmers have been through tough times in the 1980's with the depressed land prices and last year's drought. But, they're ready for the challenge of the 1990's and only ask for the chance to compete fairly and equitably. It is time for a truly national dairy policy and I urge the members of the committee to support this goal.

RECOGNITION OF COL. FRANK S. DULING

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, Col. Frank S. Duling, the city of Richmond's 11th police chief, will retire on July 15, 1989, from the position he has held for 21 years.

I have known Frank Duling since before I became involved in politics. Then, as mayor, the colonel and I worked closely together for the safety and betterment of the citizens of the city of Richmond.

The chief and his family have always held fighting crime as a matter of grave, personal concern. His father, Frank S. Duling, Sr., was a policeman until he was killed in a car wreck and his two uncles, Capt. Dan Duling and Detective Sgt. Thomas M. Duling, were officers of the Richmond Police Department.

Colonel Duling joined the police department in 1944. He began his career as a patrolman and he worked his way up the ranks, step-by-step, by volunteering to do jobs his fellow police members were not interested in doing. In the 1960's, he first earned his lifelong reputation as an "honest cop." He headed a probe on gambling. Colonel Duling has never tolerated any compromise with crime within the bureau.

Frank Duling will leave some awfully big shoes to fill. I wish him good success, a long life, and a very pleasant retirement. I thank him for his many years of dedication and service to the city of Richmond and its citizens.

NICARAGUA: SUPREME ELECTORAL COUNCIL

HON. PORTER J. GOSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Tesoro Beach accord signed by the Central American presidents in El Salvador on February 14, 1989, provided that the "Government of Nicaragua will form a Supreme Electoral Council with balanced participation of representatives from opposition political parties."

The electoral reform law passed on April 23 by the Sandinista government set forth the terms by which the members of the Supreme Electoral Council [SEC] would be selected. Under that law, lists of names would be recommended by various political parties for two of the members of the SEC and submitted to the President of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega. President Ortega would select candidates from those two lists and would also compile lists for the other three members—the two government members and the independent, "notable" person. One of the lists to be proposed by political parties had to represent non-Government parties of the National Assembly which participated in the 1984 elections. That list contained the names of candidates who consistently voted with and supported the Sandinista government. So, in fact, only one list of candidates truly represented the opposition parties in Nicaragua.

The five lists of three candidates, each compiled by Ortega, would be sent to the National Assembly, dominated by the Sandinista party, where the five members of the SEC and their alternates would be chosen.

With the publication of the electoral reform law, the opposition parties criticized the government for failing to provide the "important democratic conditions * * * necessary to inspire confidence in the elections and to guarantee that they will be free."

Specifically on the SEC, the opposition stated on April 25: "The electoral reforms maintain the executive branch's control over the Supreme Electoral Council and other electoral bodies, clearly failing to comply with the El Salvador agreements. * * * The subordination of the electoral branch to the executive branch leaves the opposition defenseless and unable to participate in a true exercise of democracy because the conditions required to hold free, just, and honest elections are nonexistent."

On May 10, 12 of the opposition parties in Nicaragua sent a letter to Sergio Ramirez, acting president in the absence of Ortega, criticizing the laws regulating the selection of the SEC. Their letter stated, "Electoral Law amendments promulgated on April 23, 1989, were unilaterally approved by the government, which scorned the opposition's demands and violated the Tesoro Beach commitments. * * * That balanced representation by opposition parties was not guaranteed in the amendments that were approved and made public. The government not only assigned to itself three of the five magistrate seats, but legally assigned a fourth magistrate seat to a political organization which includes among its membership some individuals subordinate to the Sandinista National Liberation Front [FSLN], leaving the opposition the chance to have only one of the five magistrate seats."

SELECTION OF SUPREME ELECTORAL COUNCIL

On June 7, the National Assembly selected the five members of the Supreme Electoral Council:

One. Dr. Mariano Fiallos, president of the SEC—Sandinista representative and president of the SEC for the discredited 1984 elections.

Two. Leonel Arguello Ramirez, president of the Nicaraguan Insurance and Reinsurance Institute—Sandinista representative.

Three. Dr. Rodolfo Sandino Arguello, "notable" person—selected by Ortega as candidate for this position. Dean of the University of Central America's law school and member of the SEC under Somoza. The opposition tried to get Sandino named as the president of the SEC but the National Assembly chose Fiallos.

Four. Dr. Aman Sandino Munoz, member of the Conservative Democratic Party—consistently votes with the Sandinista in the National Assembly.

Five. Guillermo Selva Arguello, member of the Independent Liberal Party—only true opposition member of SEC.

On June 14, the National Opposition Union [UNO] stated its opposition to the membership of the Supreme Electoral Council:

"The integration of the CSE [SEC], verified by the ruling FSLN wing of the National Assembly, does not establish the balance to which President Ortega committed himself in a document signed by the Central American presidents in El Salvador. On the contrary, a majority of four to one, favorable to the ruling party, will be capable of endorsing any irregularity or fraud to benefit that party."

UNO also stated, "Concerning the reelected president of the CSE, we reject that reelection, because it is no guarantee of purity for the coming elections. We base our objection on the many cases of fraud that the CSE, directed by the reelected president allowed in the 1984 elections. * * * Concerning the election of a notable person who does not belong to any political party, as a guarantee of impartiality, the FSLN majority elected a person who leans toward the FSLN, not heeding the commitment acquired with the Venezuelan Electoral Commission, which stipulated that the notable person should be selected by common accord between the government and the opposition."

THE HIGH SEAS INTERCEPTION OF SALMON

HON. JOLENE UNSOELD

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, the illegal high seas interception of U.S. salmon by driftnet fleets from Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan is the most explosive issue now facing North Pacific fisheries. Our fishermen and scientists tell us that these foreign fleets are stealing an estimated $21 million worth of U.S. salmon annually and, at the same time, indiscriminately killing thousands of seals, dolphines and porpoises and tens of thousands of marine birds every year.

Beginning around 1980, the U.S. fishing industry became aware that hundreds of foreign driftnet vessels were plying the North Pacific under the guise of fishing for squid. The boats use lightweight monofilament nets—20, even 30 miles long, to scoop salmon from hugh sections of the North Pacific. Picture in your mind 20–25,000 miles of net sweeping the ocean bare on any given day.

In 1987, Congress recognized the destructive nature of the foreign driftnet fleets and the impact that they are having on our resources by drafting the Driftnet Impact Monitoring, Assessment, and Control Act. Under this law, the President has the authority to embargo fishery products from nations who fail to enter into monitoring and enforcement agreements by today, June 29, 1989.

Just last Friday, the U.S. Commerce Department notified us that the State Department has reached agreement with the Government of Japan. While this sends a positive signal that the Japanese are finally willing to work with the United States in developing information on the effects of their high-seas fishery on U.S. resources, I am deeply disappointed with its provisions. I believe that with this agreement our resources and our fishermen who depend upon them will continue to be at risk.

With the Secretary of Commerce accepting this accord, we still have no driftnet agreements with Taiwan and South Korea. Under terms of the Driftnet Act, Secretary Mosbacher must now certify this to the President. The President will have 60 days to determine what, if any, sanctions he will impose.

Mr. President, you must use your full authority. We must get tough with countries that continue to plunder our salmon and slaughter the world's marine life.

At the same time, we should be working with other nations to outlaw this outrageous technology. In a recent meeting with Prime Minister Robert Hawk, I learned that Australia is deeply concerned about depleting of tuna stocks and broader ecological damage from the foreign driftnet fleets in the South Pacific.

International measures are urgently needed. The Soviet Union, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and virtually every other nation of the South Pacific have all expressed grave concerns over effects of these horrendous driftnet fisheries.

We must now join with these other countries to ban these ecologically destructive fishing techniques. If we fail to act now, our children may only know of this Earth's rich ocean resources and abundant marine life in the history books. We must eliminate these instruments of death. We must ban these outrageous driftnets.

IN SUPPORT OF CHINESE STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, the recent events in China have been a slap in the face of the democracies of the world. As we learn more of what took place in Tiananmen Square and throughout China, it seems that the Chinese Government ecouraged the democratic rallies for the sole purpose of luring prodemocracy sympathizers into a death trap. The violence that followed, and is continuing even now, is a blatant effort to purge the democratic roots from Chinese society. We may never know the true extent of the violence taking place.

Caught in the middle of this struggle are thousands of Chinese students here in the United States. While many students want to return home, most would face persecution, possibly death, if they were to return to China.

It is for this reason that I want to express my support for H.R. 2712, which would allow Chinese students to remain in the United States if they desire. The legislation will accomplish this in two ways: by allowing Chinese students to switch their visa status within nonimmigrant visa categories, and by waiving the student visa's return residency requirement for Chinese nationals. Most of these nationals are currently here with restrictive student visas requiring a 2-year return to China when their visas expire. To maintain this return requirement will mean certain death for a number of these students.

Our Nation was founded on the belief that people are born with certain inalienable rights. We cannot sit by while these rights are being crushed by others. President Bush has announced a series of economic sanctions. I was pleased to see that many European nations are following our lead in this area. H.R. 2712 is a sanction as well—allowing China's best and brightest to remain in this country, rather than allowing them to be used by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Stronger actions are needed, however. One of the most frustrating things about the current situation is our inability to directly help the Chinese people in their struggle.

This is the essence of H.R. 2712. It gives us a chance to assist a people struggling for democracy. Through H.R. 2712, we can help some of those who have put their lives on the line for this ideal. We can ensure that the fire of democracy remains alive in the hearts of the Chinese people.

CONGRESSIONAL CALL TO CONSCIENCE FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the continuing struggle of Soviet Jews, in the hopes that we all may help them to achieve the freedom of speech and mobility we as Americans already possess. I am honored to participate in this "Call to Conscience," and I appreciate and admire those who have also expressed their concern to me about Soviet Jews in letters, telephone calls, and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

We are witnessing now some important changes in the Soviet Union. Soviet citizens are participating in the freest elections they have ever seen, for the first time choosing delegates to represent them before their leaders. With President Mikhail Gorbachev's policy of glasnost, Soviets are allowed to express their opinions in a limited sense about the Government and its policies without fear of political or personal prosecution. While these accomplishments deserve some acknowledgement, the continued presence of silent restraints remind us all of the ghosts haunting Soviet history and looming over its future.

The absence of free emigration is still an alarming problem in the Soviet Union, particularly for Soviet Jews. For years these people have been restricted and harassed, unable to express and practice their sacred religion or leave the country in order to o so. Yet they remain ever hopeful that one day, they may live in a land where freedom is a way of life and not just a slogan at the foot of a monument. They are optimistic that one day, they may join family and friends who have already been blessed with liberty.

All of us in this Chamber have heard from families with relatives still in the Soviet Union. We have all had the opportunity to sign letters expressing our anger and dismay that such confinement still exists, even in this age of change and openness. I commend those in this body who have taken action in support of those wishing to emigrate, and I urge my colleagues to continue in these efforts.

In this body, we serve as voices of the American people. We also represent and act as the guardians of freedom around the world. As Members of Congress, then, we must take it upon ourselves to hear those in the world whose own governments do not listen. I am grateful and proud to participate in this Call to Conscience on behalf of Soviet Jews, and I urge my colleagues to join with us in this just and important cause.

TRIBUTE TO IDAHO VOLUNTEERS

HON. RICHARD H. STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to three of my constituents who have been recognized by the Department of Energy for outstanding volunteer service to their communities.

Mr. Ignacio Resendez and Mr. Michael Hargreaves, both employees of DOE's Idaho Falls Operations Office, and Mr. Ronald A. Meeks, of DOE's Idaho Falls Office of Investigations, have been selected in the Department's nationwide program to honor extraordinary community service provided by DOE employees.

I agree with Secretary of Energy James D. Watkins who calls these gentlemen "unsung heroes" in the Department and in our country who are bringing a new spirit of compassionate activism to work in our Nation.

Mr. Resendez is a native of San Antonio, TX. He is currently the chief counsel for the Idaho Operations Office. He has an extensive history of volunteer service. Since the civil rights legislation of the mid-sixties, he has worked hard for minorities. He has helped in education and health care areas and has served as a role model for young Hispanics. He has been active in interpreting church services, making presentations at seminars and filling other similar needs.

He also is dedicated to community youth programs, such as soccer and basketball programs.

Last year, Mr. Resendez was chairman of the Idaho Falls and Surrounding Area Combined Federal Campaign, supporting the United Way. Because of his leadership and dedication to this project, the total amount pledged was 12.5 percent over the previous year's campaign.

Probably the best example of his life of giving was last Christmas when a group of DOE employees wanted to make sure that those less fortunate could derive a measure of pleasure from the holiday season. Mr. Resendez took the lead, rented a Santa Claus suit and played Santa Claus for residents of Quinton Manor, a home for handicapped adults.

Mr. Hargreaves, a native of the Intermountain West, is chief of Federal personnel at INEL. he has been actively involved in supporting local programs for the handicapped. He has spent many hours helping them develop their training programs for clerical and records management. His goal was to make the training such that the graduates could effectively enter the work force. He also developed a program to help clients meet the transition of moving into the employer's permanent workforce.

Because of his commitment to the Development Workshop, an Idaho Falls, ID, sheltered workshop, he was the first awardee of the William S. and Ida T. Holden Award for Service, the highest award the workshop gives for community service. But one of his greatest rewards has been seeing the impact his commitment has had on his own family. This year his daughter was the recipient of recognition by the Governor of Idaho for her essay on employment of the handicapped.

Mr. Meeks is a criminal investigator in DOE's Idaho Falls Office of Investigations. He is currently the assistant district commissioner of the Eagle Rock District, Teton Peaks Council, of the Boy Scouts of America. He voluntarily coordinates the Scouting activities of his church on a year-round basis.

Mr. Meeks also is a coach for the Grid Kids football program and spends about 10 hours a week teaching football fundamentals to elementary school students.

As a member of his church, he also provides time each month to assist or provide

welfare services to the needy families in the church.

Mr. Speaker, each of us recognizes the important role volunteers play in communities throughout the Nation. I sincerely salute these three residents of my district who have decided to make a difference in their community.

BESSEMER BOROUGH DIAMOND JUBILEE

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and congratulate the borough of Bessemer in my Fourth District of Pennsylvania on the significant occasion of the borough's 75th anniversary of its incorporation on July 11, 1913.

This diamond jubilee recognizes the unique history and proud contributions of Bessemer Borough in the great industrial scheme of history of western Pennsylvania and the Nation.

From prosperous farm country times of the 1800's, a new industry emerged in Bessemer in 1887 when blast furnace operators from Youngstown, OH, discovered limestone in Bessemer's locale and opened quarries there to supply the blast furnaces of the Youngstown steel mills.

These men founded the Bessemer Limestone Co., taking the name "Bessemer" from Sir Henry Bessemer, an English inventor who discovered the process of using limestone in the smelting procedure to manufacture steel.

Workers for the new company arrived from Sweden, Finland, and Austria and settled in the limestone company's housing, while Italians settled in nearby Hillsville and later moved to the town of Bessemer, which kept the company name.

The Bessemer area, which was once part of North Beaver Township in the most western section of Lawrence County, PA, became Bessemer Borough with the first official organizational council meeting on July 11, 1913.

In the last 25 years the borough government has successfully completed several recreational and community projects, including parks, a new fire hall and borough maintenance building, a larger community library, a new water well, and the reconstruction of State Route 317, the borough's main thoroughfare.

This year, Bessemer Borough is culminating its diamond jubilee festivities Saturday, July 8, with a parade, program, and fireworks display.

Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, I rise today to tip my hat and the symbolic hat of this great Nation to Bessemer Borough on behalf of 75 years of hard work and progress in the industrial tradition of America. I salute the good people of Bessemer and their constructive history, and that is why I honor them and this milestone today.

FILIPINO INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, as we pause in our pleasant routine to celebrate the Fourth of July 1989, we might ask ourselves, how fares the Nation? We may recall America's Founding Fathers concluding the Declaration of Independence with "And for the support of this Declaration of Independence reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

The distinguished biographer, William Manchester, comments on the American spirit he witnessed in his World War II Marine unit, and as he observed it 35 years later when writing "Goodby Darkness." He recounts Robert Sherrod's words of the marine wading ashore in chest-high water against machinegun fire disdainful of death—"black dots of men, holding their weapons high above their heads, moving at a snail's pace, never faltering."

"Today's children are baffled by our acquiescence then in what, to them, appears to have been a monstrous conspiracy against our lives," writes Mr. Manchester. "They are bewildered by those waves of relentless young men who patiently plodded on and on toward Betio's beach while their comrades were keeling over on all sides. They ask: Why? They are convinced that they couldn't do it. And they are right. The United States was a different country then.

"The bastion of social stability was the family. Children were guided, not by radar beams picking up trends and directions from other children, but by gyroscopes built into their superego at home. Parents had a tremendous influence on them—Sheathed in obedience, reinforced by Marine Corps pride and the conviction that the war was just, the men wearing green camouflaged helmets could outfight the Japanese and they did it again and again.

"You also needed nationalism, the absolute conviction that the United States was the envy of all other nations, a country which had never done anything infamous, in which nothing was insuperable, whose ingenuity could solve anything by inventing something. You felt sure that all lands, given our democracy and our know-how, could shine as radiantly as we did. Esteem was personal too—Late the rules would change. But we didn't know that then."

World War II demonstrated the purity of America's dealings with other peoples in the Pacific. Even before World War II, when China appealed for help against the invading Japanese, President Roosevelt permitted American pilots in the Marine Corps, Navy, and Army to resign and form the American Volunteer Group under the command of Gen. Claire Chennault. This group earned the unequivocal friendship of the Chinese, so that downed American fliers were hidden, protected, and returned even at the cost of Japanese massacres of entire villages. General Chennault depended on an efficient early-warning network of Chinese across the eastern part of that great country. His fliers were the forerunners of Americans who instilled great friendship for America in the Chinese people, which was erased only by the Communist take-over of that country.

In the Marianas, the Marshalls, and in the most populous island group, the Philippines, America's friendship and considerate treatment of the islanders were repaid by intense loyalty to America during the Japanese occupation of the islands. In the Philippines, more than 40 percent of the Filipino and American prisoners who were captured by the Japanese were slaughtered on the Bataan Death March or died from starvation or disease in the prison camps. The few Americans who escaped fought with Filipino guerrillas against the Japanese throughout the occupation—a period when it seemed the United States would never return.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur pledged "I shall return" and he did, bringing an American attack force to the beaches of Leyte on October 20, 1944, and leading a conquest of that island and the others, culminating in the Japanese surrender in September 1945. To my knowledge, no American was ever betrayed to the Japanese during the dark years of Japanese oppression in the Philippines. When American troops landed on Leyte, Commander Chick Parsons, organizer of the Filipino guerrilla resistance, completed his mission there and left the island. Although he had been in company with Filipinos on several occasions when stopped by Japanese patrols, and had a $10,000 price on his head, the Filipinos always protected him. This was true of other legendary Americans who fought with Filipino guerrilla units on various Philippine Islands during World War II, such as Col. T.V. Hanson, Col. Ed Ramsey, Lt. I.F. Richardson, Lt. Don Jameson, and others.

In addition to fighting the Japanese throughout the occupation, the Filipino guerrillas furnished intelligence information to American forces before and during the retaking of the Philippines. George Bush participated in the Battle of Manica Bay as a young naval aviator. When General MacArthur waded ashore on Leyte, he had with him President Sergio Osmena and Lt. Carlos Romulo. By October 23, American forces had captured Tacloban, the capital of Leyte, although artillery and air attacks on the city continued for some time.

General MacArthur relates in this *Reminiscences* that, "I called the president (Osmena) to the wrecked and devastated capitol building 3 days after the landing, 'On behalf of my government,' I said then, 'I restore to you a constitutional administration by countrymen of your confidence and choice. As our forces advance, I shall in like manner restore the other Philippine cities and provinces throughout the entire land.' "

As fast as we freed an area, wrote General MacArthur, it was turned over to civilian administration. There was never an American military government of the Philippines during the war years.

One of the main reasons for Filipino loyalty to the United States was the conduct of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The Philippine government awarded him the Medal of Valor, and in making the presentation, President Osmena

said, "America and General MacArthur are one. He is the singular representative of the highest and best in the American ideal of freedom and democracy. He embodies the noblest in the American character and integrity of soul. In the building of the greater democratic Philippines, he will surely serve as the inspiration of our people. His name will be ever remembered by the Filipinos."

On July 4, 1946, the United States extended to the Philippines full sovereignty. The ward friendship between Americans and Filipinos lasts to this day. Many Filipinos enlist in the U.S. armed services and become American citizens. They and those from the other Pacific islands who come to the United States are a valuable addition to America. Today, our major source of immigration is not Europe, as it was in the past. It is the area to the south and the west of us—Mexico, Central and South America, the islands of the Pacific, and Southeast Asia.

These refugees who come to America, as well as those in orderly departure programs from China, Taiwan, Korea, Japan, and other Pacific nations, are the new and vital Americans who perhaps appreciate more than some native Americans what the freedom and opportunity of America means. They reinvigorate us with a love of family, respect for elders, the work ethic, appreciation of education, and loyalty to employers that may have diminished in some Americans who have been here for generations. And so, on this Fourth of July 1989, let us celebrate our new infusion of immigration, with its respect for family, freedom, opportunity, and country. With this as stimulus, let us restore nationwide our earlier virtues that made us the ideal of the world. And let us continue to extend to those peoples yearning for freedom around the world not only example, but concrete help in achieving that freedom.

PETER KOSTMAYER AND POPULATION

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Atlanta Constitution printed an oped piece which described the recent debate in the House Foreign Affairs Committee on international family planning and population programs. The article recounts the latest effort of our colleague, PETER KOSTMAYER, to ensure that adequate family planning assistance is available to the developing world, where more than 90 percent of global population growth occurs.

Congressman KOSTMAYER has been one of the House of Representatives' leading advocates of international family planning for many years, and I commend him for his tireless and effective work on this issue.

I ask that the article from the Atlanta Constitution be printed in the RECORD at this point and recommend it to my colleagues.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, June 1, 1989]

LEGISLATIVE LEGERDEMAIN TESTS BUSH ON POPULATION

(By Werner Fornos)

WASHINGTON.—The recent attempt to eliminate functional accounts from the U.S. foreign-aid program provides fascinating insights into the innate bizareness of the legislative process.

Congress employs these accounts to clarify its intentions to the executive branch, which has been known to stray from the purpose for which the law was written.

For instance, Congress expects the Agency for International Development to spend a portion of its allotted funds on population and family-planning assistance to Third World countries, where more than 90 percent of global population growth occurs.

Washington lawmakers deemed population aid sufficiently important to put it down in black and white as a functional account in the foreign-aid authorization bill.

The very notion of functional accounts conjures up the ultimate nightmare of the federal bureaucrat, spending authorizations cluttered by congressionally-mandated specificities.

Along comes the House of Representatives Task Force on Foreign Assistance with a bill aimed at streamlining the authorization process by unloading such excess baggage as earmarks and functional accounts.

Although there are only some half-dozen functional accounts in the Foreign Assistance Act, the task force sought to nip potential proliferation in the bud by abolishing them all.

The loudest hue and cry rose from advocates of population assistance on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which reviewed the measure. Most, if not all, of these supporters of population aid are also proponents of expediting foreign aid.

For that matter, the co-authors of the task force bill—Reps. Lee Hamilton (D-Ind.) and Ben Gilman (R-N.Y.)—and an avid promoter of their efforts, Rep. Dante Fascell (D-Fla.), chairman of the committee, consistently and staunchly favor international population assistance.

The task force measure, a document of well over 300 pages, came before the committee last week, at which time the arguments for eliminating functional accounts were presented.

However, Rep. Pete Kostmayer (D-Penn.), an outspoken champion of population aid, offered an amendment calling for retaining such assistance in a functional account.

Mr. Kostmayer asserts that population and family-planning aid is a controversial area of the foreign humanitarian program, "one that is often discussed in the shadow of an emotional domestic debate." He expresses concern that funds Congress intends for this purpose require the protection of a functional account to avoid being diverted to "politically safer and seemingly more immediate needs."

The Foreign Affairs Committee overwhelmingly approved his amendment.

Before Mr. Kostmayer and his supportive colleagues can be written off as hopeless Malthusian paranoids, it should be noted that the Reagan administration succeeded in severing all U.S. support for the United Nations Population Fund and sharply reducing our contributions to the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Moreover, the Bush administration has given every indication that it intends to continue the Reagan administration's policies in this area. In a recent report, "Development and the National Interest," the administration views rapid population growth as a perception rather than a problem.

When it deigns to mention population at all, the report does so in such terms as "Improved health has affected population growth in virtually every developing country. The population 'problem' actually reflects the progress made in keeping people alive throughout the world."

It is a well-known fact that advances in medical science have considerably extended human longevity. But it is also true that, despite perhaps equally important progress in contraceptive technology, Third World women average nearly five children during their reproductive lifetimes compared with less than two for women in the industrialized world.

Furthermore, the World Fertility Survey has reported evidence that fully 50 percent of reproductive-age developing world women need and want to control their fertility but lack access to family planning.

Capitol Hill sources claim the Bush administration has made the House Task Force Foreign Assistance bill a major legislative priority.

A floor fight on an issue already decisively approved by a committee is frequently an exercise in futility. But in this case, the administration could have three key allies—Messrs. Hamilton and Gilman, two of the most respected members of the committee, as well as committee Chairman Fascell, one of the most powerful members of Congress.

How far the Bush administration is willing to extend itself on the matter of functional accounts may well be the most revealing sign yet of the depth and breadth of its commitment to global population stability.

THE VENERATION AND PROTECTION OF THE FLAG

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, on a September night back in 1813, a young man from a town called Upper Marlboro, in my home State of Maryland, prayed alone in the gallows of a British frigate for the fate of the newly founded nation of the United States of America. It was the War of 1812 and this young soldier, William Beanes, had been captured and detained on board the enemy's ship in the Chesapeake Bay—a ship that was about to launch a surprise attack on Baltimore's Fort McHenry.

Old Glory flew high over Fort McHenry at the twilight's last gleaming that night when the brutal British bombardment began. But the smoke of the battle soon obscured its broad stripes and bright stars. Those Americans on the frigate that night, with their hearts back on the American shore under that proud flag, searched vainly for Old Glory in the rocket's red glare.

One of those trapped and frantic Americans was the lawyer hired to negotiate the release of William Beanes. The lawyer had come to the ship to free the young soldier but was then detained himself as the battle commenced. That lawyer's name was Francis Scott Key.

The euphoria of the moment when Key first spotted the American flag, "catching the gleam of the morning's first beam," will be forever cherished in our National Anthem. "The Star-Spangled Banner" is the country's greatest testament to the American Flag and the courage for which it stands.

Mr. Speaker, there have been too many brave Americans like William Beanes and Francis Scott Key, too many men and women who have left their homes and families to defend the freedoms we enjoy as Americans, too many great American patriots, Mr. Speaker, have sacrificed their lives for the veneration and preservation of this flag to allow it to be profaned.

As we are all aware, the Supreme Court made a decision last week to allow the profanation of our national flag. I feel strongly that the Court erred in its decision and that the flag must be protected from desecration.

To this end, I am introducing legislation to amend the United States Constitution to prohibit the desecration of the flag. I urge everyone to join me in preserving our Nation's most cherished emblem.

H.J. RES. —

Whereas there is no greater, more beautiful, or instantly recognizable symbol of the Nation and its ideals, traditions, and values than the flag of the United States;

Whereas the flag is emblematic of the rights and freedoms articulated in the Constitution of the United States and cherished by the people throughout the country;

Whereas the stars and stripes attest to the bravery of individuals who dedicated their lives to founding the Nation;

Whereas the individuals who have fought and died under the flag did so to ensure that the Nation would survive and that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people would endure;

Whereas the flag flies free today because of the sacrifices of countless patriots who held ideals of the Nation in higher esteem than individual accomplishments;

Whereas the birth of the Nation and the fight for liberty have become forever tied to the flag and its survival;

Whereas the flag represents the United States to other countries and carries a message of hope to the afflicted, of opportunity to the oppressed, and of peace to all people;

Whereas the colors of the flag signify the qualities of the human spirit that Americans cherish: red for courage, white for pure ideals, and blue for justice;

Whereas the flag has accompanied brave Americans throughout a proud history, from Yorktown to the North Pole, to Iwo Jima, and even to the moon; and

Whereas the flag stands for the land, the people, the government, and the ideals of the United States, and it merits deference, veneration, and protection under the laws of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission for ratification:

"ARTICLE

"The Congress may by law prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States and set criminal penalties for that act."

THE OMEGA BOY'S CLUB OF SAN FRANCISCO

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to pay tribute to the Omega Boys Club of San Francisco. Every day the news is filled with horror stories about the drug abuse problem in our Nation and its effect on the youth of our country. In the face of this tragedy, it is heartening to find a group of young people who have organized to fight the drug problem in their own lives and in their own community.

On Friday, July 14, Omi-Neighbors In Action will present its good neighbor award to these impressive recipients. Omi-NIA is nationally recognized for the creative way it has dealt with the drug problem at the local level and its acknowledgement of the Omega boys is an example of this approach. I join with Omi-NIA congratulating the Omegas for a job well done.

The Omega Boys Club of San Francisco is an organization for youth that emphasizes academic achievement and non-involvement with drugs. The club was founded in March of 1987 by two San Francisco unified school district employees, Joe Marshall and Jack Jacqua, and has grown from its initial 15 members to its current number of 80 youths, all of whom aspire to the club's principles of brotherhood, scholarship, perseverance, and uplift.

The Omega Boys Club requires its members to maintain the highest standards in their academic and social lives. In particular it asks club participants not to use or sell drugs and to concentrate instead on academic achievement. The club's directors monitor members academic and social progress and offer counseling and support. Last year, 16 of the club's members were awarded college scholarships; this fall, 21 will have achieved the same success.

The Omega Boys Club runs weekly study hall/tutorials in five areas of San Francisco and the boys club parents prepare hot meals which are served at the end of these tutorials. In recognition of the uniqueness and success of their approach, the Omega Boy's Club is the first youth organization to have been asked to do peer counseling and outreach in San Francisco's juvenile detention centers.

Mr. Speaker, the Omega Boy's Club has been honored at both the local and national level for its important work in the "war on drugs." I ask my colleagues to join with the Omi-Neighbors In Action in recognizing the achievement of these young people in motivating their peers to do their best in life and to find satisfaction in academic and social achievement.

OPEN SPACE AROUND CITIES IS SHRINKING

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 26, 1989, I read with great interest an op ed column in the Philadelphia Inquirer written by my friend and colleague, PETER KOSTMAYER of Pennsylvania, on the issue of open space and farmland preservation.

Representative KOSTMAYER, chairman of the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations of the House Interior Committee, has made the loss of open space in America a top priority on his panel's agenda. "Open Space: America's Landscape in the 21st Century" on May 18th was the initial hearing in a series to be held on this significant subject.

Mr. KOSTMAYER presents the hazards of unplanned growth policies that may adversely affect future generations. He underlines the dangers we face of losing those natural and historic qualities of our land that we Americans truly admire.

I would like to share with my colleagues Mr. KOSTMAYER'S article "Open Space Around Cities Is Shrinking" which shows great foresight in his thinking regarding our natural environment.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 26, 1989]

OPEN SPACE AROUND CITIES IS SHRINKING

(By Peter H. Kostmayer)

West Chester, Washington Crossing, Malvern, Newtown, Exton, Lionville. Until about 30 years ago, the rural areas near Philadelphia looked much as they had in the early part of our country's history. Farms, forests, meadows, village squares surrounded by stone dwellings—these hallmarks of the Pennsylvania landscape were largely unchanged for nearly three centuries.

Today, we are in danger of losing these natural, cultural and historical qualities that help define our region. Suburban Philadelphia is in the throes of a development binge that is devouring our remaining open space, farms and historic buildings—transforming our countryside into a series of lookalike malls, shopping centers and housing developments. Development is destroying everything from apple orchards to Revolution-era farmhouses.

The statistics are alarming. According to a Penn State University study, Pennsylvania each year loses 70,000 acres of farmland to development. Since 1960, my congressional district in Bucks and eastern Montgomery Counties has lost 73 percent of its farms.

In New Jersey, 830,000 acres of farmland, nearly half the state's total, were destroyed by development between 1950 and 1985—an average loss of 24,000 acres per year. During 1985 and 1986, moreover that rate of loss almost doubled with an additional 90,000 acres being converted. If this trend continues, the Garden State will have no farmland at all by 2010.

Across the country, we have lost between 70 million and 100 million acres of open space to development since World War II

with much of this loss coming in the highly populated Boston to Washington corridor.

As a nation, we have for the most part neglected to examine the haphazard way in which America handles growth—we have failed to ask, let alone answer, the question of how we should balance our genuine need for economic development and growth with the equally important task of preserving and protecting our country's natural and historic legacy.

While the federal government continues to play a major role in protecting parks, forests and wilderness areas, the task of managing growth in our cities, towns and rural communities has fallen largely to local governments.

On May 18, the House Interior Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chair, held the first in a series of hearings to examine the scope of the overdevelopment phenomenon and to determine what should be done to influence the way our country grows.

A single day's drive through our congested suburban landscape demonstrates that the traditional fragmented and strictly local approach to controlling development has failed. Created to serve rural populations, many local governments are increasingly incapable of dealing with development pressures and are ill-prepared to provide the service and infrastructure required by an expending populace.

A "quiet revolution" is taking place in such states as New Jersey, Florida, Oregon, Vermont, Hawaii, Maine and Georgia, all of which have recently undertaken statewide growth management programs in an effort to battle haphazard development by instituting planning requirements on a widerscale. In many communities, local conservation groups have taken it upon themselves to work with developers to promote environmentally sensitive construction, which respects local historic and natural resources and preserves them for the future.

By themselves, however, these local and state actions are not enough. The time has come to reassess our national policies toward development. For most of our history, it has been our policy to promote growth on every front.

Beginning with the Homestead Act of 1862 and the Mining Act of 1872 and continuing with scores of statutes enacted over most of the next century, the federal government has provided economic incentives for development. That policy continues through such programs as federal flood insurance, highway development funds and grants for other infrastructure improvements.

These federal policies often serve to encourage suburban sprawl at the expense of America's great cities, including Philadelphia. Major infusions of federal aid for those cities then become necessary precisely because so many middle-class families have relocated to new suburban areas.

It is time to take a second look at the impact of these policies. We should consider tying some of this federal development aid to sound growth-management principles carried out at the local level.

We need a new ethic in this country that acknowledges the value of preserving a "national landscape." Such an approach is already at work in many parts of Europe. Britain protects the area around London with a "Greenbelt" where development is strictly limited. France and the Netherlands have put in place comprehensive national farmland preservation programs.

The stakes are high. Studies show that Americans desire recreational opportunities in open space areas close to home—precisely the areas currently being paved over without so much as a second thought. The more we continue to develop without planning, the fewer will be our opportunities to preserve a livable environment.

Imagine Philadelphia without its 8,700-acre Fairmount Park or New York had planners not set aside room for Central Park. Then imagine trying in 1989 to buy 8,700 acres in Philadelphia or 843 acres in the middle of Manhattan Island for open space. If we fail today to preserve green areas in our rapidly developing suburbs, clearly we won't be given a second chance.

Americans have always drawn strength and inspiration from our country's open landscape and natural beauty. We celebrate our frontier history and make heroes of our mountain men and pioneer women.

America's greatest leaders all recognized that when we degrade our natural beauty and fail to protect our environment, we diminish both our natural resource base and the American spirit. It should be clear to any thoughtful observer that we cannot continue mindless development without risking much of what we have come to love in our country.

OAK WILT: THE REAL THREAT TO THE SURVIVAL OF OAKS

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month a 600-year-old historic oak tree in my city of Austin, TX, was given a heavy dose of a powerful herbicide in an act of malicious and criminal mischief, endangering its survival. Since then the tree known as the Treaty Oak has become a focus of national attention and concern.

Legend has it that Stephen F. Austin, the father of Texas, signed a treaty with the Indians under the 50-foot tree's branches. While the story appears to have some foundation in fact, the Treaty Oak is a cherished landmark in the city of Austin.

State and national experts have developed a plan to help the tree in its struggle against the effects of the herbicide which was deposited in the roots, and I am pleased to report that experts who have examined the tree this week are encouraged that it has withstood the poison so well, although it will probably take a year or two to know for sure if the tree will survive because of the potential for delayed stress.

The outpouring of public concern over the fate of this legendary oak is certainly gratifying, and I want to associate myself with those who have deplored the senseless act of vandalism which has threatened its survival.

However, oak trees in my State face a threat much greater than that posed by random incidents of vandalism. The survival of Texas oaks is in serious jeopardy because of an infestation that threatens both our national and private oak forests, yet which is largely overlooked as a funding priority.

I am speaking of the epidemic spread of the fungal disease known as "oak wilt", which has already killed over 10,000 trees in my district around Austin, TX, and wiped out literally hundreds of thousands of live oaks, red oaks, and Spanish oaks in 36 counties of my State. you can travel for miles through some parts of central Texas without seeing a healthy oak tree, and there are parts of the State where this is the dominant species—and just about the only shade we've got. It is impossible to exaggerate the impact this disease is having—it is changing the landscape of the Southwest.

Now, the Federal Government has provided matching funds for oak wilt suppression programs through the Cooperative Pest Suppression Fund of the U.S. Forest Service's division of State and Private Forestry. As this subcommittee well knows, this program must also fund suppression of the Gypsy Moth, the Southern Pine Beetle, and the Spruce Budworm.

These funds are absolutely crucial to State and local efforts to control and halt the spread of oak wilt, yet the administration's budget proposed to reduce the revenue available to the States from $42.6 million in fiscal year 1989 to only $8 million in fiscal year 1990. Given existing priorities, it appears to me that such a cut would eliminate funding for oak wilt suppression.

This proposed reduction reflects a shortsighted approach on the part of the administration, which is essentially "If the infestation isn't on Federal land, it's not our problem." Well, the oak wilt fungus does not recognize the sanctity of our Federal forests any more than it observes local or State boundaries. If States and local government cannot provide matching funds to assist private landowners, the fungus that destroys oak trees on private land today will be wiping out Federal forests tommorrow.

My State Forest Service advises me that funds for cooperative suppression programs are just half of what they were 10 years ago. In my view, that kind of reduction is simply "penny wise and pound foolish," because it is going to cost a lot more to confront this problem when it becomes more severe than it is to deal with it now.

Let me give you just one example. There is a quiet, shady residential area in Austin known as Walnut Creek which is rich with native Texas oaks. Some 10 years ago, the oak wilt fungus began to infect those trees, but people weren't aware of the severity of the problem and cooperative suppression funds weren't available.

Now, the owners of 170 individual pieces of property have signed an application for an $80,000 suppression program. They are willing to put up $40,000 of their own money in order to save their neighborhood. If we had addressed the problem 10 years ago, it would have affected only one-tenth the property and cost only one-tenth the money. Clearly, we can pay now to save our trees, or pay later to remove the dead ones later—at a much higher cost.

Private property owners in Austin have spent or agreed to spend $125,000 of their own money this fiscal year to stop the disease. To help property owners, who don't have the financial resources to make that kind

of commitment, neighborhood groups came up with an imaginative fundraiser that has become an annual event focusing public attention on the problem. In 1988, the Live Oak Festival raised over $10,000.

The continuation of Federal support for cooperative pest suppression efforts is essential to fighting oak wilt, but it is not the sole solution. I also asked the Interior Subcommittee to allocate research funding specifically for oak wilt studies, provide cooperative funding for reforesting efforts, and revise the administrative funding formulas to recognize State expenditures for oak wilt suppression.

I understand that the subcommittee authorized $13 million for the suppression program and $106,000 in research funding earmarked for oak wilt studies. This represents a significant increase over the administration's request, and I applaud the subcommittee for giving this issue the high priority which it deserves. This is an important step forward, and I hope that the full committee will agree with the subcommittee and that we will fully fund these important programs.

Oak wilt is now spreading through my State, wiping out thousands of centuries-old oaks that are a living treasure to its residents. I was recently honored by the International Society of Arboriculture for my efforts to combat the spread of oak wilt, and I greatly appreciate that honor. But it is not a Texas problem.

Allowed to spread unchecked, it is only a matter of time before this killer will threaten hundreds of thousands of native trees. It is just too important a priority to be left begging for funds, and I hope that the subcommittee will give careful consideration to this criticial need.

ARIAS' FAREWELL TO WRIGHT

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an eloquent farewell letter from Oscar Arias Sanchez, President of Costa Rica, to JIM WRIGHT.

Arias praises WRIGHT for his vision and courage in bringing peace to Central America, and expresses his personal gratitude. The letter from Arias is printed below.

Speaker WRIGHT, today as you leave for Fort Worth, my colleagues and I join President Arias in expressing our heartfelt appreciation for all you have done for peace in Central America.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, June 6, 1989.

[Translation-Spanish]

Mr. JIM WRIGHT,
Longworth Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: Your farewell speech on the floor of the House of Representatives confirms for me two of your greatest virtues: your sincerity and your patriotism. I congratulate you for that decision so honest and in keeping with the dignity of the high office in which you served with intelligence and passion. I believe that part of the ordeal to which your adversaries subjected you in recent months was a way of getting back at you for your support of the effort to terminate the violence between brothers which is covering Central America in blood. Those opposed to peace will not forgive you for the fact that thanks to your vision and your deep commitment to the highest ideals of justice, peace, and process, the Esquipulas II process finally moved forward and is showing visible results for 28 million Central Americans.

The Wright-Reagan Plan, the bipartisan agreement between the Congress and the Executive, and finally the change in policy of the Bush Administration toward Central America, are a testimony and confirmation that you were not mistaken. In truth, you did more for us Central Americans than many of those who here call themselves standard bearers of freedom. I feel that it has been a privilege to know you. Count me among your friends.

Cordially,

OSCAR ARIAS SANCHEZ.

RECTIFYING THE "NOTCH YEARS"

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives a letter President George Bush has received from Mrs. Martin (Faye) Wells of Murray, KY.

As my colleagues can see, Faye Wells' parents, John Ralph and Cova Mildred Clark, are victims of the "notch years." To quote Mrs. Wells, "the Congress has the moral obligation to restore it (social security) to them." I share Mrs. Wells' views and encourage my colleagues to work with me toward rectifying this unfair situation which involves Mr. and Mrs. Clark and millions of other Americans born between 1917–21.

I encourage my colleagues to read Mrs. Wells' letter.

JUNE 19, 1989.

President GEORGE BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH: You are receiving this letter because I honestly believe you will read it and do what you can.

I am writing on behalf of my parents, John Ralph and Cova Mildred Clark. They farmed the first 15 years of their married life, with the exception of Dad's tour of duty in the Army (No benefits involved.) Then, Dad worked at a sawmill, and Mom worked at a garment factory (no retirement benefits) to supplement their farm income and to educate their two children. Dad finally had the chance to work in a stove plant, but it closed down and moved when he had only 10 years of service and a tiny retirement benefit.

Mom was born in 1918 and Dad was born in 1919, both in the infamous "notch years." They retired at age 65, yet they had to retire at almost one half of what they had planned for, simply because of the changes enacted by Congress to "save" Social Security. The people born in 1922 and thereafter receive less than those born in the "notch years", but they have had at least a five year interval to prepare for the decreased amounts they will receive at retirement. Those individuals born during the "notch years" had no warning and no time to prepare. Instead, they were forced to retire with a little more than one half of what they had planned on for years.

Since Mom and Dad's retirement some five years ago, they have managed to continue to be the dependable, patriotic, honest, bill-paying, law-abiding, tax-paying, God-loving people they have always been. Yet, during that time, Mom developed Lukemia and Dad has had four surgeries, one of which was open-heart bypass. I've watched them dip into what little savings they have to meet their obligations and maintain their dignity. They've never received one cent of welfare! They deserve better than this, because they've earned better than this!

Now that social security is "secure", they and all individuals born during the "notch years" have every right to have their social security restored to the amount they are entitled to receive—to the amount of all of the individuals born before 1917. The Congress took this from them, and now, the Congress has the moral obligation to restore it to them. Otherwise, their rights are being violated! We pour billions and billions of dollars into "giving" substantial amounts of money to people who do not or will not work. Yet we expect those people who have worked all of their lives to live on a little more than half of what they have rightfully earned! It's a disgrace! They took care of us in years past, and the very least we can do for them is to restore to them what they were originally and are morally entitled to receive. Don't you agree, Mr. President?

With warm regards,

Mrs. FAYE C. WELLS.

1989 ARTISTIC DISCOVERY COMPETITION

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, decorating the tunnel leading to the U.S. Capitol Building is a collection of 255 paintings, prints, and drawings from nearly every State, territory, and the District of Columbia. This exhibit represents the culmination of the eighth annual nationwide Congressional Art Competition, "An Artistic Discovery 1989." This competition, sponsored by the Congressional Art Caucus and Members of Congress, offers Members and the public the opportunity to experience and encourage the budding artistic talents of American youths.

I am proud to report that "An Artistic Discovery 1989" includes prize winning artwork from Ben Johnson, a Lincoln West High School student from within my congressional district. This year, more than 130 entries were received from 13 high schools in the 21st District. I am delighted to welcome Ben to Washington today for the opening ceremonies where his winning entry, "Skyline With Bridges," will join other artwork in a special display area.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the high school principals, art instructors, and organizations throughout my con-

gressional district for their support of this important effort. Their continuing involvement helped make "An Artistic Discovery 1989" a great success.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and visitors to take the opportunity to view the most impressive talents of young American artists. I have included a listing of the students from my congressional district who participated in "An Artistic Discovery 1989."

"AN ARTISTIC DISCOVERY 1989"
COMPETITION: 21ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

1. Bedford High School: Barry Gott, Halle Guffey, Milon Hutchinson, Ernest Jolly, and Julie Presby.
2. Bellefaire School: John Hynes, Greg Petusky, Daniel Pitcher, Allison Seltzar, and Alden Stewart.
3. Cleveland Heights High School: Brian Amin, Chris Baldini, Hallie Braverman, Tina Brugnoletti, Christopher Cook, Shay Lawanda Davis, Yasha Davis, Joyce M. Ehrlinger, Rachel Freer, Patrina Hollowell, Leon Jones, Beata Marks, Dannielle Merriman, Sam Rose, Nicole Skettle, Lesley Story, Nicole Tubbs, Kevin Wasserman, Nicole Winbush.
4. Cleveland School of the Arts: Rayshawn Hunt.
5. Collinwood High School: Bennie De Loach, Gail Melton, Roderick Stewart, Terry Turk, Rachel Winfield, Christoper Young.
6. East High School: Lasander Reese, Juane Small, Del Mario Watts.
7. John Adams High School: Tracy Brown, Jennifer Burrows, Michael Camper, Stephanie Chesnut, Kimberly Hicks, Derrick Jenkins, Jesse Jordan, Marie Lassiter, Anthony Long, Sabrina Paige, Clarrissa Schwandt, Michelle Sheppard, Jaydoyle L. Walker.
8. John Hay High School: Nicole Bridget, Nicole Petty, Jennifer Prell, Terrance White.
9. Lincoln West High School: Ronald Ivy, Ben Johnson, Chris Maragh, Dodd Sinkfield, LaShawn Thomas.
10. Lutheran East High School: Aaron Koonce, Samm White.
11. Shaker Heights High School: Lynn Boyd, Coleman Burditt, Monica Gonzalez, Chad Hursh, Brett Hurst, Allison Proper, Kathryn Thompson, Gail Weiner.
12. South High School: David Collins, Herman Duncan, Donna Kent, John Lampley Jr., Mark Moore, Randy Pritchett, Kevin A. Reeder, Toy Robinson.
13. Warrensville Heights High School: Reginald Delk, Fred Dixon, Deyampert Giles, Robert King, Julius Nichols, Travis Smith.

THE KINO MISSIONS NATIONAL MONUMENT ACT

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to introduce legislation that will add two important archaeological sites to the existing Tumacacori National Monument in Arizona. These additions will add immeasurably to our knowledge, understanding, and enjoyment of a fascinating period of American history—the Spanish exploration and occupation of what is now the American Southwest.

Both sides are associated with Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, a pioneer explorer and settler who established a line of missions on the Spanish frontier in what is now northern Mexico and southern Arizona until his death in 1711.

The first addition would encompass the ruins of Los Santos Angeles de Guevavi, which was the first mission established in Arizona. It was probably founded in the 1690's and the first resident missionary arrived in 1701. By the end of the 18th century it had been abandoned, and is thus unimpaired by continuous occupation and reconstruction. It is a real treasure of archaeological information about the early Pima Indians and their relationship with the first Spanish missionaries.

Recently, the Archaeological Conservancy in Santa Fe, NM, acquired the 7-acre property from Mr. Ralph Wingfield. For many years, Mr. Wingfield cared for the remains of the old mission, which is located on his ranch along the Santa Cruz River 15 miles south of Tumacacori. After trying for years to interest historical societies, churches, and governments in protecting the mission site, Mr. Wingfield recently reached agreement with the Archaeological Conservancy for transfer of ownership and management. The conservancy is anxious to cooperate with the National Park Service.

The second site contains the Kino visita and rancheria ruins of Calabassas. It, too, is rich in archaeological information and has been little disturbed by modern development. Calabassas was acquired by the Archaeological Conservancy several years ago and it, too, will be turned over to the Park Service.

The incorporation of these three sites into a single monument will do a great deal to advance our understanding of the powerful role of Father Kino and the Spanish settlement on the history of America. I think it appropriate that the monument be renamed in his honor. I do recognize, however, that there is some controversy over the redesignation of the monument and am open to arguments about whether this is appropriate. I look forward to hearings on the bill to determine whether the name change is the appropriate way to go.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this legislation will have the support of the administration and everyone else interested in the preservation and interpretation of our diverse cultural history.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN DIARMUID PHILPOTT

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly outstanding member of the San Francisco Police Department, Capt. Diarmuid Philpott of the Ingleside Police Station. By his tireless efforts to improve police community relations and through his work with the young people, Captain Philpott has made a major contribution to the local "war on drugs" and to the safety of the community to which he is assigned.

On Friday, July 14, OMI-Neighbors in Action will present its good neighbor award to this impressive recipient. OMI-NIA is nationally recognized for the creative way it has dealt with the drug problem at the local level and its acknowledgment of the work of Captain Philpott is an example of this approach. I join with OMI-NIA congratulating the captain for a job well done.

Captain Philpott was instrumental in the creation of several important programs for the youth of his community. At Oceanview Park, under his guidance, a Police Athletic League [PAL] Program was instituted which involved both patroling the park facility and neighboring area to get rid of drug dealers as well as involving the police in the recreational programs at the park so that the young people could get to know the police in other ways than law enforcement. This program is the only one of its kind in San Francisco and it has already made a difference in the lives of the residents, young and old.

Another unique opportunity for young people which the captain engineered for his community is the San Francisco conservation corps "youth in action" program. The 40 neighborhood youth who have been employed as corpsmembers will learn about issues that are critical to the well-being of their community and environment. In addition to the work experience on neighborhood improvement projects, these young people will meet with community and city leaders, teach younger children what they have learned and experience a challenge to their old ways of thinking.

The work of Captain Philpott does not stop with youth. He has assisted in the formation of over 40 block clubs, groups of neighbors who watch out for one another. He attends the steering committee meetings of the OMI-Neighbors in Action and participates in the neighborhood mayoral task force. Captain Philpott performs all these activities in addition to his regular responsibilities as the captain of Ingleside Station. His neighbors believe they have in him a real friend who keeps their welfare uppermost in his mind and heart.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me and the OMI-Neighbors in Action as we recognize the achievement of a dedicated and effective community servant, Capt. Diarmuid Philpott.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING ACADEMY OF MOTION PICTURE ARTS AND SCIENCES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR JAMES M. ROBERTS

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, virtually every American alive today has been deeply affected by a movie. The people who create motion

pictures hold a special place in our society. As executive director for the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences for the last 18 years, Mr. James M. Roberts has had a distinct influence on the movie industry and on American life.

Mr. Roberts will retire from the Academy this July. We would like to mark the occasion of Mr. Roberts' retirement by recognizing his many noteworthy accomplishments.

Mr. Roberts is a native of Canada. He joined the Royal Canadian Air Force at the age of 19 where he became a fighter pilot. While in the military, he met and married Thelma Williams. Mr. Roberts later earned a Bachelor of Commerce degree from the University of Toronto. After graduation, the couple moved to Los Angeles where Mr. Roberts found a job as a bank auditor.

In 1954, Mr. Roberts was named controller of the Academy. In 1971, he became assistant executive director and then, later that year, he was selected to become executive director of the Academy. Mr. Roberts was also appointed executive secretary of the Academy Foundation, a non-profit educational foundation.

The Academy clearly flourished under Mr. Roberts' expert leadership. Under his direction, the Academy's staff and activities more than tripled. The Academy's library became the most important film research center in the world. To accommodate the organization's changes and growth, Mr. Roberts led the Academy through a move into a seven-story specially designed headquarters in Beverly Hills.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to salute James M. Roberts for his many distinguished contributions to the film community. We wish him and Thelma the best of luck in their retirement years and hope they enjoy their well-earned time off.

THE MISCELLANEOUS ERISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1989

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, today the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Management Relations, Representative WILLIAM L. CLAY, and I are introducing legislation which makes needed technical corrections and several other changes to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 [ERISA]. The legislation reflects many of the provisions of H.R. 4845 as adopted by the Committee on Education and Labor last August.

With the enactment of these changes, I would hope that we could draw to a close the past decade of rapid-fire tax law and revenue-driven changes which the pension plan community states has caused an era of uncertainty in employee benefits planning.

By creating a more certain legislative environment, we may well induce more employers to consider installing pension plans and improve the pension coverage ratio which has remained stagnant at around one-half of the work force.

Several of the changes in the bill relate to the health care continuation coverage provisions adopted under the Consolidated Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 [COBRA]. The many complexities connected with COBRA continuation coverage make these rules deserving of further oversight and scrutiny by the Congress.

The legislation introduced today will also restore the principle written into ERISA and reaffirmed in the 1980 amendments, the Multiemployer Pension Plan Amendment Act, that the special nature of jointly administered Taft-Hartley multiemployer pension plans require separate treatment from single-employer plans in connection with plan funding rules. For example, the 150 percent cap on the full funding limitation added in the 1987 Budget Reconciliation Act will cause instability in both the funding and the collective bargaining aspects of multiemployer plans. By restoring the full-funding limitation under prior law, the legislation would avoid punitive action on employers who have already agreed to negotiated multiemployer pension plan contributions.

Also in connection with the 150 percent cap on the full-funding limit as applied to single-employer pension plans, I look forward to receiving the results of studies by the ERISA agencies and any recommendations they may have for avoiding any possible adverse consequences on plan establishment or solvency because of the imposition of this new cap.

The computation of the full-funding limitation included under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 [OMBRA 1987], for single-employer pension plans has also created another potential inconsistency with the newly required PBGC variable rate premium structure. To avoid the possibility of imposing a variable rate premium on employers maintaining full-funded plans, the legislation would exempt such plans from the variable portion of the PBGC premium.

Clearly, these and other anomalies which have crept into ERISA and the tax code need correcting, and the many provisions of this bill are deserving of bipartisan scrutiny and consideration.

CHINESE GOVERNMENT EXECUTES STUDENT WHO CONFRONTED TANKS

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as the world anxiously watched the unfolding drama of the Chinese students' quest for freedom and democracy, one haunting image stands out as symbolic of the courageous plight of these students—the brave student who stood unarmed in front of a long line of army tanks and turned them back. This hero was identified as Wang Wei Lin.

He, like many of those courageous students and workers who fought against the brutal military forces, apparently died at the hands of the Chinese Government. The South China Morning Post, a Hong Kong newspaper, reported on June 18 that Wang Wei Lin was feared executed by Chinese authorities:

Using his body of flesh and blood, Wang Wei Lin, a 19-year-old student who blocked a convoy of tanks near Tiananmen Square, is feared to be already executed.

The London Weekly Express reports Wang Wei Lin, a factory worker's son, has already been arrested by the secret police. All over the world, hundreds of millions of viewers saw Wang Wei Lin on the second day of the Tiananmen bloodbath. Using his body of flesh and blood stopping 20 tanks while shouting, "Turn Back! Do not kill my compatriots!"

Express Mail reports Wang was arrested three kilometers from where he stopped the tanks. He was accused of being a counter-revolutionary, traitor, political hoodlum, and also attempting to disrupt the People's Liberation Army.

During a government broadcast against the pro-democracy movement by a state-controlled TV station, Wang's friend identified him among a parade of dissidents. Wang's hair was shaven. In China, only the accused prisoners have their heads shaved. Wang's friend says that he thinks that he has already been executed.

He also said, "He is a hero. If Wang is publicly executed, he would become a martyr. His execution would draw protests from the whole world." Unconfirmed sources said that the commanding officer of the column of tanks was demoted and reprimanded—Because of Wang Wei Lin, the People's Liberation Army lost face in front of the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Wang Wei Lin and to the other brave Chinese students and workers who died in China in the struggle for freedom and democratic reforms in their homeland. These young people indicated the unwavering and irrevocable commitment to liberty and human rights by placing their lives on the line for these values.

I invite my colleagues to join me today in honoring and paying tribute to Wang Wei Lin and those who participated with him in the struggle for the democratic future of China.

FOREIGN ADOPTION LEGISLATION

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year Congressman BARNEY FRANK and I introduced H.R. 1686, which seeks to clarify the conditions permitting the immigration of certain adopted children.

When the Immigration Reform and Control Act was enacted in 1986, it included an amendment offered by Congressman FRANK pertaining to the right of a natural father of an illegitimate child to petition for immigration on that child's behalf. What was intended to be an expansion of the right to petition was subsequently used by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to narrow the definition of an orphan in immigration law.

The Frank amendment dealt with section 101(b)(1)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 [INA]. In a March 1987 memorandum, the INS reasoned that extending such a right to an American natural father under that

section meant that foreign natural fathers of illegitimate children should be considered under section 101(b)(1)(F) of the INA. Such an interpretation effectively changed the definition of an orphan. Previously, the mother of an illegitimate child was considered the sole parent and could relinquish her child to be adopted. The child was then allowed to immigrate to the United States to be with his or her adoptive American family. INS determined that a natural father who has or had a bona fide relationship with the child was also a parent. Therefore the child had two parents and was no longer an orphan under U.S. immigration law.

This matter came to my attention last year when three Florida families were in the process of adopting children in the Dominican Republic and were prohibited by INS from bringing the children home because of the new interpretation of the law. We were finally able to prevail upon INS to grant the children humanitarian parole because they had already been placed in foster care and had no homes to which they could return. A legislative solution, however, is required to ensure that congressional intent is followed and that such children are never again prevented from joining their loving American families.

During consideration last year of the Commerce, State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill for fiscal year 1989, former Senator Lawton Chiles of Florida was able to include language to permit U.S. families to adopt foreign illegitimate children who may have had at some time a bona fide relationship with their natural fathers. The Chiles language was amended in conference to state that the term "parent" in section 101(b)(1)(F) does not include the natural father of the child if the father has disappeared or abandoned or deserted the child or if the father has in writing irrevocably released the child for emigration and adoption.

Mr. Speaker, because the current language will expire with the fiscal year, it is imperative that we make the necessary permanent legislative change. Congressman FRANK'S bill, H.R. 1686, should solve this problem once and for all. Countless Americans who wish to form their families through adoption will benefit from this legislation, and the rights of the natural parents will not be endangered. The bill will eliminate any uncertainty about the eligibility of such children and restore the application of our immigration law concerning orphans to its pre-1986 status.

CALL TO CONSCIENCE FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join many of my colleagues in expressing support for the removal of all restrictions on the emigration of Soviet Jews.

The Soviet Union has made undeniable progress recently in opening the door to emigration. If current trends continue, more Jews will be allowed to emigrate this year than in any year since 1979. This is one of the most positive achievements of glasnost.

However, many unreasonable barriers to emigration remain. I would like to call attention to one justification that is still given by the Soviet authorities as grounds for the denial of permission to emigrate—the supposed knowledge of "state secrets" on the part of the applicant.

There are hundreds of outstanding refusnik cases where such knowledge is supposedly the only barrier to the emigration of an individual or an entire family. However, in many of these cases, the access to alleged state secrets occurred years ago, sometimes as many as 25-years.

I would like to call attention to one specific case. Vladimir Raiz of Vilnius and his wife Karmela have been refusniks for 14 years; their emigration has been blocked due to Mr. Raiz's alleged access to classified information during his employment in the Ministry of Radio Industry over 20 years ago. On May 3, Mr. Raiz was informed by a high official in this ministry that he was no longer considered to be a security risk. Now deprived even of this flimsy justification, the local authorities continue to deny Mr. and Mrs. Raiz the right to emigrate. There can be no further justification for this refusal.

The conflict in this case between the Ministry of Radio Industry and the emigration authorities makes perfectly plain the misuse of the state secrets justification for the denial of emigration. We have entered an era of new openness in relations between our country and the Soviet Union. Our military delegations have been given leave to inspect top-secret Soviet military installations. Does the denial of emigration based on 20-year-old alleged secrets mesh with this new openness? The state secrets policy is a remnant of a period of Soviet history that belongs firmly in the past. It contradicts glasnost.

I call on the Soviet Union to begin immediately a fair review of all existing and new emigration applications that are denied for this reason. This should be one of the first steps toward the codification of a new policy on the emigration of Soviet Jews—one that will result in the free emigration of this group, which has suffered for too long.

FLORIDA SEMINOLE INDIAN ACT OF 1989

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation along with my colleague and fellow Floridian, Mr. LEWIS, on behalf of the Seminole Tribe of Florida, the Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida and the Independent Seminole Indians of Florida with respect to a dispute that has arisen between the Seminole Tribes of Florida and the Oklahoma Seminole Nation over the funds awarded to both the Oklahoma and Florida groups by the Indian Claims Commission.

In 1976, the Commission awarded a $16 million judgment in favor of the Seminole Nation as it existed in Florida on September 18, 1823. The claim was based upon the fact that the Seminoles had received unconscionably low consideration for a large land cession that had been made in 1823. In the early 19th century, a large number of Seminole Indians were moved by the U.S. Government to Oklahoma while an unknown number of Seminoles hid out in the Everglades and remained in Florida. The descendants of these people now make up the Oklahoma and Florida Seminole groups.

Members of the Oklahoma delegation to Congress have proposed legislation that would divide the award based solely on population, strongly favoring the Oklahoma Seminoles by giving them approximately 75 percent of the award, which has now grown, with accumulated interest, to approximately $45 million. In my opinion the proposed Oklahoma bill is highly inequitable.

The Oklahoma proposal would divide the judgment between the Oklahoma and Florida groups based upon population figures arbitrarily developed in 1977 by the Bureau of Indian Affairs from a 1906 census and 1914 census. This approach totally ignores the different history of the Oklahoma and Florida Seminoles and the actual history of the claims litigation.

The Oklahoma Seminoles received very substantial consideration in the form of 265,000 acres of land and over $7 million in treaty payments under the treaties which gave rise to the claims. The Florida Seminoles were almost totally ignored until the 1930's.

Eventually the lands the Oklahoma Seminoles received were allotted to individuals. Many of these allotments were sold so that individual members of the Oklahoma group also received additional significant compensation late in the 19th century. Many others retained their allotments and their descendants continued to enjoy the benefit from this ownership, including royalties from oil and gas production.

In addition, I am advised that because of the benefits received by the Oklahoma group, which were not shared at all by the Florida Seminoles, the judgment received was significantly reduced. In summary, the Seminoles who remained in Florida shared none of the benefits afforded the Oklahoma Seminoles under the Seminole Treaties, but suffered an offset against the claims because of benefits received by the Oklahoma group alone.

Because of these factors and others, I believe that there are very strong reasons supporting the 50-50 split that is proposed in my bill—factors at least as strong as those which support the Oklahoma proposal.

It seems very clear to me that Congress is not really in a position to make the detailed judgment as to what the precise split should be between the Oklahoma and Florida groups. Incidentally, I am advised that there is no dispute as to the division of the Florida share between the Seminole Tribe of Florida, the Miccosukee Tribe and the Independent Seminoles and my bill specifies a precise division of the Florida share.

If legislation proves ultimately necessary, then I believe the appropriate recourse would be to refer the matter to the U.S. Claims Court

for necessary factfinding under the legislative reference procedure. If such a reference is made, Congress should request detailed findings on all relevant circumstances—not just population. I am reluctant to propose that solution now before the parties have had one final chance to resolve their differences. If negotiation continues to prove fruitless, I am prepared, at an appropriate time, to introduce the necessary resolution for a legislative reference.

If meaningful negotiations do resume, I think Congress should make it clear that it expects the Bureau of Indian Affairs to play a neutral and constructive role. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by reports that last year Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs Ross Swimmer took a very strong position in favor of the Oklahoma Seminoles and reportedly functioned more as an advocate for their position than as an arbiter. I am even more disturbed by the report that Mr. Swimmer agreed, in March of this year upon his departure from the BIA, to represent the Oklahoma group, with a possibility of a very substantial contingency fee, within days after his term as Assistant Secretary of the Interior concluded, and despite the fact that he was substantially involved in BIA's activities on this matter when he served as Assistant Secretary.

I am pleased that my colleague Mr. Tom Lewis is joining me as the original sponsor of this bill. We hope that our colleagues will see this bill as a fair distribution and join us in supporting this legislation when Congress returns from the Independence Day district work period.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PREVENT DISRUPTION ON CABLE TV

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am submitting legislation which will hopefully prevent a major disruption to some of the most popular programming enjoyed by cable television viewers. I know that we in Congress are well aware of the public outcry that can result from such a disruption, particularly when it involves sports programming.

Federal Communications Commission rules, scheduled to go into effect in less than 6 months, pose a great threat to cable television consumers throughout the country. If the Commission's rules go through, consumers are faced with bewildering program changes, or even worse, the loss of favorite programming that may not be available elsewhere.

This legislation is designed to ease the burden of transition that may be required under the Federal Communications Commission's syndicated exclusivity rule. This rule would require blackouts of syndicated television programs on cable television in markets where a local broadcast station also has that show. This rule will have a profound negative effect on the so-called cable superstations, and smaller regional stations that are extremely popular with viewers. No one likes blackouts. Cable systems may be encouraged to drop some superstations, causing a viewer uproar like the one that occurred here locally last year that eventually became so vociferous that the system had to return the station. As a matter of fact, 20 Members of Congress even signed a letter to that cable company asking for the return of that station, which brings popular Chicago Cubs baseball to the Washington area.

This type of cable consumer outrage could occur on a national level if syndicated exclusivity is put into effect without the transition relief that is contained in my legislation. Blackouts are scheduled to take effect very shortly after the legality of the syndicated exclusivity rule is decided by the courts. Virtually every cable system has three or four distant signals.

The Commission rule has been challenged in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on a number of grounds. Syndicated exclusivity will be the most sweeping change in the history of cable television programming and will essentially change copyright law, jurisidiction over which does not reside in the Commission. The rule is also being challenged for its lack of findings based on public interest need. Commissioner Patricia Diaz Dennis stated that many of the reasons used to support the rule are, "unconvincing, wrong, or both."

Setting aside the merits of the legal challenge to the Commission's rule, there is still quite a problem that stems from this case. It's outcome will not be decided until the end of this year—yet cable system blackout compliance is required by the FCC syndicated exclusivity rules on January 1, 1990.

With 6 months remaining until blackouts begin, already there are reports of widespread confusion and misunderstanding concerning syndicated exclusivity rules within both the cable and broadcast industries. Sound public policy dictates that the cable industry have a reasonable transition period that begins at the time when the process of judicial review is completed, and all uncertainty about the legality of the rule has been removed.

After all, the intent of the rule is not to limit the diversity and availability of cable television programming, but to require program changes where syndicated exclusivity poses a problem. By delaying implementation of the FCC rule by one year, my bill does not undermine the intent of the rule, but simply prevents it from creating serious problems for the consumer and possibly eliminating popular programming.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AGGIE BOND EXTENSION ACT

HON. FRED GRANDY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to extend by 3 years the sunset date on the Federal tax exemption of small issue private activity bonds for first-time farmers, commonly called Aggie bonds, and for manufacturing facilities in rural areas. Under current law, these programs are due to sunset at the end of this year. Joining me in this effort are Congressmen MADIGAN, LIGHTFOOT, JOHNSON of South Dakota, JONTZ, OLIN, and ESPY.

Mr. Speaker, if I have one complaint about present agricultural policy, it is that we have not done enough to assist our next generation of family farmers. Where FmHA and the FCS have failed to provide the crucial financing necessary for young, and not so young, people who have a sincere interest in beginning to farm, the Aggie bond programs have impressively helped to fill the gap. This legislation will help preserve this vital source of help and hope.

I, along with 15 of my fellow Members, recently signed a letter to House Ways and Means Committee Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI which was circulated by my fellow Iowan DAVE NAGLE. That letter expressed our desire to have the Ways and Means Committee consider extending the sunset date on the Aggie bond provision. Congressman HATCHER has introduced House Concurrent Resolution 156, which myself and 46 other Members have cosponsored. This concurrent resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the existing authority to issue tax-exempt small issue bonds should be extended 1 year.

This proposed legislation goes one step further in providing the Ways and Means Committee with something concrete to work with and to contemplate attaching to other bills which they will be considering in the coming weeks and months. Of the 11 tax provisions expiring in 1989, the cost of extending the Aggie bonds provision is the lowest of them all. It is estimated that allowing the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for first-time farmers and manufacturing facilities in rural areas in fiscal year 1990 would result in the loss of only $7 million in potential Federal tax revenue. At the same time, these same bonds could underwrite approximately $3 billion in economic activity.

The National Council of State Agricultural Finance Programs [NCOSAFP], organized in 1984, reports that over 3,905 loans have been extended by State agricultural bond authorities in 23 States for a total amount of over $410 million. In surveys conducted by that group it was found that 77 percent of the recipients of Aggie bond-generated loans used them to make their first land purchase and 66 percent of the recipients indicated they could not have made the purchases in question if it hadn't been for the tax-exempt bond-based loans. The program also provides a boost to rural financial institutions as most banks that use the program are under $100 million in total assets and only 23 percent of them are members of multibank holding companies.

In my home State of Iowa, the Individual Agricultural Development Bond Program [IADBP], more commonly known as Iowa's Beginning Farmer Program, has approved 890 loans for a total of $79.5 million since its inception in the summer of 1981. Of these approvals, 630 bonds have been issued in the amount of $50 million.

Bond authority organizations in 30 States have issued small issue bonds related to manufacturing facilities in a total amount of approximately $2.8 billion. This low cost tax pro-

vision is a vital source of funding for projects across the country in both urban and rural areas. It is my hope that the existing private activity bond program for manufacturing facilities and first-time farmers is extended; that is why I have cosponsored Representative HATCHER's concurrent resolution. The legislation I introduce today, however, would alter the current program by focusing bonds for manufacturing facilities on facilities located in rural areas. I do this in order to recognize the valuable tool this tax-exempt bond program is for rural development.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that if these particular tax provisions are allowed to expire at the end of 1989, we will be shutting off a vital source of financing for future generations of family farmers and entrepreneurs at a time when so few sources are available. Entry into farming and business is almost totally dependent upon accessible and affordable credit. I urge my colleagues to join me and the cosponsors of this bill by supporting this effort to help America's beginning farmers and entrepreneurs. Thank you.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

AGGIE AND RURAL MANUFACTURING BOND EXTENSION ACT OF 1989

SECTION 1. 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF EXEMPTION FROM SMALL ISSUE BOND TERMINATION FOR FARMING PROPERTY AND RURAL MANUFACTURING PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 144(a)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to termination of qualified small issue bonds) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) by inserting before the comma "which, as of the date the financing is provided, is located in an area which the Secretary of Agriculture determines is a rural area", and

(2) by striking "1989" and inserting "1992".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to bonds issued after December 31, 1989.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR THEODORE GILDRED

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following editorial from the Buenos Aires Herald be entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article from the major Argentine newspaper pays tribute to the former United States Ambassador to Argentina, Theodore Gildred.

It is with great pleasure that I call my colleagues' attention to the exemplary and outstanding performance of our retiring Ambassador to Argentina, Theodore Gildred. Ambassador Gildred is returing to his home in San Diego to tend to his business and for a well-deserved rest after 3 years of active and effective service in Buenos Aires.

United States relations with Argentina, previously unstable at best, hit a record low in the period following the Malvinas—Falkland Islands—War. It was Ambassador Gildred who ably promoted United States interests in the uncertain period following the return of democracy to Argentina. It is beyond doubt that the rapid establishment of a strong bilateral rapport and the mitigation of our differences with Argentina were greatly facilitated by the diplomatic skill of Ambassador Gildred. United States relations with Argentina have rarely been so good.

Despite the many difficult problems confronting the United States and Argentina, Ambassador Gildred departs as an immensely popular man in that country. His contribution to the improvement of bilateral relations is greatly appreciated and his presence there will be sorely missed.

President Bush recognizes Ambassador Gildred's abilities and has asked him to consider another diplomatic assignment in the future. In response, Ted Gildred stated his willingness to serve his country again.

In the meantime, I and all of his friends in San Diego are proud of his accomplishments and happy to have him home. We thank him for his work as Ambassador to Argentina and hope he will consider returning to diplomatic service.

[From the Buenos Aires Herald, May 28, 1989]

BUILDING BRIDGES

(By Ronald Hansen, Editor)

In the next couple of days the current US ambassador to Argentina will be returning home after completing his tour of duty in this country, an event about which much has been said in the press. What is not so easily understood about the time Theodore Gildred spent as chief of the US mission in this country is just how complex a posting it was when he first took it on and, perhaps more importantly, how much has been achieved since that happened. Much of the credit must be given to Ambassador Gildred himself, who, with a diplomatic skill belying his inexperience in the field, both ably and actively participated in all manner of events around the country, making him arguably the best-known US ambassador ever to serve in Buenos Aires who, unlike some of whose predecessors, departs as an immednsely popular man in this country.

In the aftermath of the tragic Malvinas War and following the repeated clashes between the last military government and the US administration, bilateral relations hit an all-time low, an unfortunate situation which was further compounded by a whole range of matters such as the extremist anti-Americanism found within some local political circles, the foreign debt crisis and a sometimes less than clear support for the democratic regimes of the world coming out of Washington. With the return of democracy to Argentina a whole new range of opportunities opened up, a situation which created an enormous amount of uncertainty in both countries about the future. Common ground was rapidly established and both countries were able to iron out most existing differences and, in hindsight, it must be said that the current relationship with the United States has rarely been so good.

It is always hard to define just how much of a good understanding between governments is a result of correct policies being carried out and how much flows from the rapport established between those representing each side. Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that both Argentina and Washngton have taken substantial steps towards dovetailing their policies towards one another, a course of action which, it is hoped, will continue, despite the respective recent changes of government. Enormous difficulties still exist, mainly the unresolved problem of the foreign debt, and in days to come representatives of both countries will have to thrash out mutually acceptable, meaningful solutions to these outstanding problems. It is to be hoped that when doing so, they will find that the good work carried out by Gildred will serve as a solid basis for the building of a new era in US-Argentine relations. It would be the best tribute possible to one man's contribution to the better understanding between the peoples of both countries.

FOR UPHOLDING ROE VERSUS WADE

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court will soon be releasing its decision on Webster versus Reproductive Health Services. The decision in this case could severely limit or even overturn Roe versus Wade, and send women back to the nightmare of illegal—and often fatal—back alley abortions.

I am submitting for the RECORD a letter from a constituent of mine who, after being raped in 1962, was forced to undergo an illegal and highly dangerous abortion. Fortunately, she survived to speak out for the thousands of women who died. I urge the Supreme Court to listen to the voices of millions of women before making any decision to take away or limit this important, personal choice.

LOS ANGELES, CA, *March 19, 1989.*

Congressman MEL LEVINE,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEVINE: I am writing to you regarding possible up-coming challenges to the Roe v. Wade decision. I am encouraging you to defend the Law of the Land, as provided by this Supreme Court decision providing for the on-going right for women to make decisions about their own bodies.

In 1962, living in the Mid-West, I was a married woman, and was raped by a stranger. My personal physician and my personal gynecologist both told me that they were helpless in the face of the law, and there was nothing they, nor I, could do about this pregnancy, except to accept it. That felt like being raped for the second time.

After the illegal abortion, performed by a back-alley "doctor," I spent several days in a hospital with high fever, infection, and had to undergo surgery. All of this should be unnecessary.

Please, allow women to decide what happens to their own bodies, and allow the Roe v. Wade decision to stand.

With concern,

ELIZABETH COHEN.

WE, THE PEOPLE

HON. GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the remarks I will make to the citizens of Will County at the Memorial Stadium in Joliet, IL, on July 4, 1989.

WE, THE PEOPLE

It is with great pleasure that I join you, and all Americans, in celebrating the birth of our Nation, Independence Day.

In the immortal words of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, we find the reason why all Americans should celebrate July 4th as a National Holiday. "Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." And it was another famous American, Daniel Webster, who in 1830 described our democracy as "the people's government, made for the people, made by the people and answerable to the people." It is most appropriate, therefore, that once every year we, as a nation, take time to remember the birthday of this great republic and to remind ourselves and our children of why this nation was born.

It was sheer boldness (and some would say even madness) for 56 representatives of 12 colonies to sign the Declaration of Independence on that July 4 in 1776. They were like Little David, facing the Giant Goliath, their Goliath being England! They were in essence, telling a powerful King George III that since his government was tyrannical, "* * * it [was] the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government." And as if to underscore that they knew the possible dire consequences of their actions, they added as a conclusion: "* * * for the support of this declaration, * * * we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

It is indeed fitting that we remember these heroes: John Hancock, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson, among others. Yet, who were these revolutionaries? Professor Waldo Braden describes them thus: "They were mainly farmers, planters, merchants and lawyers. Some were rich. Many were self-made men who had to work hard for what they had; one had actually been a bond servant." Of the original 56, more than half paid dearly. They lost homes and property, were taken prisoner, lost sons and their own lives. They lost much, but never their sacred honor.

Shakespeare once asked, "What's in a name?" The names that fill the proud pages of our history ring like the liberty bell: Concord, "where the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard 'round the world", Valley Forge, where Washington's ill-clad soldiers left bloody footprints in the snow; Bunker Hill and Yorktown, sacred to our memory; Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence was adopted and the Constitution drafted; Patrick Henry, who demanded liberty or death; Nathan Hale, who regretted he had but one life to give. And during the terrible years of the civil war, there were the names of Grant and Lee, of Gettysburg, and Chancellorsville, and Abraham Lincoln, who wept that the union was being rent asunder.

Unhappily, many of the names that remind us of the gift of freedom are a litany of battles: Verdun, Bastogne, Normandy, Iwo Jima, Guadalcanal, Heartbreak Ridge, and Pork Chop Hill. What's in a name? For an American, a stark reminder of the price of loving freedom and honor above life itself.

* * * * *

When we watch the accounts of anti-American demonstrations in foreign countries on TV, what is the first thing we see? The burning of the American flag, an act of contempt toward the democracy and freedom in America which it symbolizes. We are outraged, and rightfully so. Should we be less outraged when it happens right here at home? The answer is no. And I believe that those who endangered their lives by courageously and boldly signing our Declaration of Independence would weep if they were here today to witness the desecration of our beloved flag which is taking place under the protection of the first amendment to that Constitution.

But is it only with picnics, parades, and fireworks that we remember each July 4? During the height of the Nazi threat, President Franklin Roosevelt reminded all citizens that, "It is simple—I could say simple-minded—for us Americans to wave the flag, to reassert our belief in the cause of freedom—and to let it go at that." He was reminding us that our vision of freedom must embrace the whole world. It was the same sentiment that John F. Kennedy expressed when he said that we should "* * * regard any threat to the peace or freedom of one as a threat to the peace and freedom of all."

Today, we hear repeated the phrase "people power." Initially, that concept was a tribute to the brave people of the Philippines, who confronted soldiers and tanks with flowers and won their freedom from a tyrant. In recent months, the students of China reflected "people power" in Tiananmen Square, and the world applauded their courage. But freedom is never cheap; it is purchased with the blood of martyrs. The butchers of Beijing may have temporarily crushed a people's peaceful demonstration with brute force, but they forget that no army is stronger than an idea whose time has come. That for one, brief, shining moment, a replica of our Lady Liberty and cries of "freedom and democracy" were present in the very heart of Communist China and should remain a symbol that freedom is both contagious and fragile. It was Thomas Jefferson, who warned that, "the price of freedom is eternal vigilance."

As Americans, it is our duty to hold high the torch of liberty to the world. We work with head and heart and hands to keep the original American dream alive. We are legion, and we are diverse, but we are Americans, all. We are the judges and the lawyers whose duty is "to establish justice." We are the law-enforcement officers and the firefighters who "ensure domestic tranquility." We are the teachers who touch eternity and the students who ask for truth. We are the children who trust that they will continue to live in America, the beautiful. We are the doctors and nurses and health-care professionals who "promote the general welfare." We are the National Guard and the conventional armed forces who protect this land "from sea to shining sea." We are the journalists who expose corruption even in the highest places. We, the people, are workers; we build the skyscrapers, the homes, the roads and bridges. We are the farmers who put bread on our tables, here and abroad. We are the scientists and the inventors; and we walked on the moon! We are the musicians and the poets who sing of "the blessings of liberty." We, the people, inspire; we are the ministers, the priests, and the rabbi's who teach the glory of goodness and the shame of evil. We are the elected officials who represent us and make the laws "for ourselves and our posterity."

A melting pot of different colors, creeds, and classes, we awaken to an alarm clock and go to our work because, to paraphrase Robert Frost, "we have promises to keep and miles to go before we sleep." We endure, but we will survive because, as the great novelist William Faulkner put it, "we alone, of all creatures, are capable of pity and compassion and sacrifice."

As a people, we were not defeated by Pearl Harbor or Watergate or Irangate, and we will survive and ultimately defeat the scourges of drugs, AIDS, pollution, discrimination, and corruption. But, we must be ever vigilant against the abuse and arrogance of power, whether it be on Wall Street or on Main Street—whether it be by big business or by big government. To fail in our vigilance would mean the death of "people power."

And so, on this July 4, 1989, let us, as a united people, "highly resolve that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth." For this noble cause, let us, too, as did our forefathers, "pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

THE QUIET ONES

HON. ALFRED A. (AL) McCANDLESS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1989, The Quiet Ones, an organization of Korean war veterans headquartered in Palm Desert, CA, will hold its first annual Remembrance Day Memorial Service in Riverside, CA. Unfortunately, since the House will be in session, I will be unable to attend this important commemoration in the 37th Congressional District—the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

I am glad to see that those who served and died, 54,246 courageous Americans, are finally beginning to receive the national attention and appreciation they have deserved for 36 years. Public remembrances, and eventually, the Korean War Memorial here in Washington, will help serve as a country's thanks for the valiant fight for freedom we took part in from 1950 until 1953.

As a member of the Marine Corps Reserve who served in the Korean theater, I am proud of my fellow Americans who served there, and proud of the role we played in holding the line of freedom.

I commend The Quiet Ones for their efforts and dedication in helping to raise the national consciousness about America's stand for democracy in Korea.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY SILSBY BROWN, M.D.

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Dr. Harry Silsby Brown, founder and chairman of the board of Surgical Eye Expeditions International [S.E.E.], who in this capacity has been a driving force in the organization's goal of relentlessly reducing surgically correctable blindness throughout the world.

Dr. Brown is a graduate of the George Washington School of Medicine, and the Jules Stein Eye Institute. He is currently a fellow of the American College of Surgeons, and an employee of the Santa Barbara Medical Foundation Clinic. Dr. Brown has donated 15 years of selfless service to the disadvantaged, blind, and visually impaired through Surgical Eye Expeditions International.

Through Dr. Brown's leadership as chairman of the board of S.E.E., hundreds of opthalmologists, nurses, technicians, pilots, and support personnel throughout the world have been inspired to donate their time, professional skill, and personal resources to bring sight to those who would otherwise live in darkness.

Dr. Brown, architect of S.E.E.'s global sight-saving services and proud U.S. patriot, has served in the spirit of voluntarism as an international ambassador of good will. Therefore, I ask the House to join me in paying tribute to Dr. Harry Silsby Brown for his commitment to bringing sight to the lives of the curable blind, and extend our best wishes for continued success in his future endeavors.

FEDERAL FIRE SERVICE PAY SCHEDULE ACT OF 1989

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. MORELLA and I introduce today a bill to establish a pay schedule for Federal firefighters which would be separate from the general schedule and to revise the rates of pay for Federal firefighters.

The general schedule was designed to cover a wide range of employees and occupations and assumes that all such employees work a standard 40-hour, 5-day workweek. As it is designed, the general schedule cannot fairly and adequately compensate Federal firefighters who work, on the average, a 72-hour workweek and perform highly skilled and, sometimes, hazardous functions which are unique within the Federal workforce.

Because of the inequities in pay and overtime computation which Federal firefighters experience under the general schedule, it has become increasingly difficult to recruit and keep trained firefighters. The compensation and opportunities for career advancement offered by State and municipal fire departments is generally more attractive than the current compensation offered by the Federal Government.

The pay schedule and overtime provisions in the bill accurately reflect the nature of the duties and responsibilities of Federal firefighters at every level of the Federal fire service. Also, careers in the Federal fire service will be more attractive to competent and well-trained firefighters.

A RICH SYMBOL IN A SYMBOL-POOR WORLD

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 1989 the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Texas versus Johnson flag burning case. Like so many other citizens of this great country I was dismayed by the Court's decision. In condoning the desecration of the flag the Court has denied protection to the United States' most powerful and endearing symbol.

This decision comes at a time when we as a nation need the strength that comes from our flag and all that it symbolizes. It is a symbol for the Nation, a rallying point in times of trouble, and a unifying force in times of peace. More than any other national symbol, the flag reminds us of the ideals that were voiced by our Founding Fathers. It emboldens and stirs our hearts. It has moved a nation to accomplish great deeds in times of adversity. It reminds us of what we have been, what we are, and what we can become.

Yet the flag is more than a symbol for ideas and ideals. It is a symbol of actions and deeds. Who is not moved by the sight of the Marines struggling to hold the flag aloft at the Iwo Jima Memorial? Or by the flags which mark the final resting places of those who made the ultimate sacrifice for the flag and the country it represents? One of the most moving sights that I have ever witnessed has been the sight of over 250,000 flag-marked graves at Pine Lawn Cemetery in Lindenhurst, NY. I cannot fathom what that sight means to those who visit loved ones there. No words can express the emotion of seeing the flag at half staff or draped upon the casket of honored dead. The flag has been there when we as a nation witnessed brave astronauts expand the frontiers of science and discovery, and tragically, when those efforts cost them their lives.

For these reasons and so many more the flag instills passion in the hearts of Americans. I am proud that one of the privileges of being a Member of Congress allows me to distribute flags to my constituents. Over the 14 years that I have been in Congress I have had thousands of flags flown over the Capitol for constituents. I am happy to note that I receive more requests every year. I have also chosen to display the flag both inside and outside my office because of my intense pride in the principles that it represents.

The flag is a living symbol of our Nation and its aspirations and ideals. It is a testament to the unity of our Nation despite political and geographical differences. It represents the ideas which forged a nation and the ideals of the men and women who have led that Nation to greatness. It is a sacred symbol of the deeds and actions of those who gave their lives so that we may continue to enjoy the privileges of the Nation that it stands for. For all that our flag represents we cannot allow it to be desecrated. I pledge myself to do all that I can to preserve the honor and integrity of our flag.

RULE ON H.R. 1594, TO EXTEND MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS [MFN] FOR HUNGARY FOR FIVE YEARS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the Democratic caucus, I wish to serve notice to my colleagues that I have been instructed by the Committee on Ways and Means to seek less than an open rule for the consideration by the House of Representatives of H.R. 1594, to extend most-favored-nation status [MFN] for Hungary for 5 years.

RECYCLING PROMOTION ACT

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducting a bill to promote recycling in this country. Solid waste is a big problem. Every Member of this House represents hundreds of thousands of people who have garbage. Any wise strategy to deal with that garbage has to include recycling. The bill I am introducing today, with Mr. RINALDO and Mr. HOCKBRUECKNER, offers the foundation of a sound, coordinated, and flexible Federal program to promote recycling.

First, it will promote markets for goods with recycled content. What good is that? Isn't recycling about sorting your trash and returning your bottles to the grocery store? I'm from Oregon, where we do sort our trash and return our bottles, and we think that's important. But unless we have something to do with the paper and the bottles and the plastic, separating it out is an empty exercise. It will end up in the landfill anyway.

So this bill will promote markets for recycled products. It directs the Commerce Department to gather information on use of recovered material, to coordinate recycling related business-promoting efforts at EPA, SBA, DOE, and other agencies, and to promote innovative uses of recycled material. It encourages Federal agencies to "Buy Recycled" though an overhaul of our cumbersome and sometimes

confusing existing law on Federal purchase of recycled goods. And it directs Federal agencies to weed out regulatory restrictions that hamper recycling.

Second, this bill will encourage sound solid waste planning on the State and local level. It directs EPA to work with the States to gather inventory data on the waste we generate and the options we have to deal with it. It sets new guidelines for responsible planning for the States, and rewards the States that comply by allowing them to refuse to accept garbage from States that don't have a responsible solid waste plan.

Third, this bill will lay down new standards for consumer packaging. It will allow EPA to stop the use of materials like toxic inks that make packaging difficult to recycle. It will promote wise consumer choice by establishing standards for the use of terms like "recycled" and "recyclable" and requiring packaging that can't be reclaimed to bear an "unrecyclable" label. And it will establish a system for coding of plastic containers to make their recycling more practical.

Fourth, this bill will allow EPA to single out items for special treatment if they need to be separated from the normal waste stream for safe recovery or disposal. An example is car batteries. Consumers will be able to return these to stores where retailers or distributors can channel them to safe recyclers. It's a system that may be put to work for a variety of consumer goods, from tires to old insecticide containers. And it will allow the market to reflect the true costs of disposal of these items.

Finally, the bill has a special incentive for Federal agencies to recycle. It gives their budgets credit for any money they earn by selling separated paper or other garbage. That's money that now goes straight back into the general Treasury pot.

This bill is not a complete answer to our solid waste problems. In the recycling area alone, there are many promising legislative ideas already before this body—including in the bill authored by one of my cosponsors, Mr. HOCKBRUECKNER. But my bill does offer some new ideas I think many can support.

Sometimes in our rush to progress, we have been more clever than wise. We have built both great cities and great piles of trash.

These days of limited budgets and not-in-my-backyard politics demand that we be both clever and wise: Clever, to do more with limited finances, and wise, to find acceptable solutions to protect our environment. That is a tall order, but it is in that spirit that I offer this bill. I hope that for a small investment of Federal effort, it will return a great environmental return.

TRIBUTE TO LEE RIGGAN

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Lee Riggan, executive director of the Ventura-Oxnard Commission on human Concerns, who recently received the 1989 Ventura County Commission on Human Concerns Angel Award.

Mr. Riggan graduated from California State University, Northridge, with both a bachelors degree and a masters degree. In 1976, he joined the commission on human concerns, a nonprofit agency which is a major source of assistance to Ventura County's poor. The commission on human concerns is instrumental in providing food, homeless service, legal assistance, and affordable housing to those in need.

Mr. Riggan has since served this organization in various positions: community developer, Nutrition Outreach Program coordinator, senior program developer and analyst, acting director of planning and community development, and currently executive director.

Mr. Riggan's commitment to the commission on human concerns has proved to be invaluable. Therefore, I ask the House to join me in paying tribute to Mr. Lee Riggan for his dedication to the betterment of mankind.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to the Findlay, OH, "Rally Around the Flag," I was unavoidably absent missing one rollcall vote this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 128.

PARIS HUMAN RIGHTS MEETING CONCLUDES

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, the 35 States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] completed in Paris the first of three 4-week meetings on what has been called the Conference on the Human Dimension of CSCE or the CDH. The meeting, mandated by the Vienna Concluding Document, examined a wide range of human rights and humanitarian issues within the context of the Helsinki process.

The head of the U.S. delegation to the meeting, Ambassador Morris Abram, was instrumental in pursuing the U.S. objectives in seeking full implementation of the human rights and human contacts provisions of the Helsinki accords. He was a skilled negotiator and orator who won the respect of many of the representatives of the 35 nations gathered. Ambassador Abram, by the way, will become our representative to the United Nations in Geneva, Switzerland, and I wish him much success with his new responsibilities there.

In addition, there was a strong presence in Paris of nongovernmental organizations and private citizens concerned with human rights—from both East and West. These groups and individuals, as well as public members on the U.S. delegation, provided much substantive information on compliance with CSCE human rights commitments, as well as support for the CSCE process.

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, on which I serve as cochairman, also played an active part in the U.S. effort at the Paris CDH Meeting. Prior to the opening of the Paris meeting, the Helsinki Commission held a hearing on human rights trends in the U.S.S.R. The proceedings from that hearing helped form many of the themes that were discussed by the U.S. delegation during the Paris meeting. Senator DENNIS DECONCINI, the Commission's outstanding chairman, had the opportunity to attend the opening session of the meeting, where he also held a bilateral meeting with representatives from the Soviet delegation.

In addition, I, along with my colleagues BEN CARDIN and DENNIS ECKART traveled to Paris near the end of the meeting, at which time I introduced a U.S. proposal during a plenary session calling for free elections and the establishment of multiple political parties within all the signatory countries. This proposal, Mr. Speaker, represents a long-term Western goal: democracy in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, government based on the will of the people. As we have seen during the past year, the citizens of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe long to exercise their right to determine their own future, a right which has for so long been denied them. It is time for free elections and political pluralism in these countries, and the Paris meeting set the stage for realizing these goals.

The Paris meeting achieved a number of positive results. There was a thorough review of the implementation of commitments undertaken by the participating States when they adopted the Vienna Concluding Document in January 1989. During this review, progress in implementation was acknowledged, as it should be. However, continued Soviet and East European violations of the rights of national minorities and religious believers and restrictions on the rights of free assembly, association, and expression, as well as noncompliance with human contacts provisions, were also given considerable attention.

The brutal treatment of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria during the course of the meeting, including mass expulsions from that country, was condemned by many of the delegations, as was the continued existence of the Berlin Wall. Romania was criticized heavily and repeatedly for denying even the most basic rights to its citizens. Even the Soviet Union joined in criticizing the announcement that the Romanians had begun construction of a barbed wire fence along its borders with Hungary. Outstanding Soviet family reunification cases were raised, as was the denial of self-determination to the Baltic peoples. Czechoslovakia was criticized for harassing, detaining, and imprisoning human rights activists, however, the criticism apparently fell upon deaf ears as we have learned today that Frantisek Starek, a Czechoslovak underground publisher was sentenced to a 2½-year jail term for his alleged dissident activities.

The United States was criticized as well, in particular for denying visas to official Soviet trade union members and for not ratifying the International Covenants on Human Rights. The above actions by the signatory States typify how far we have come, yet what distance remains in obtaining full implementation of the provisions of these documents.

In Paris, there was also an in-depth discussion of the human dimension mechanism described in the Vienna Concluding Document, which provides for continuing dialog on individual cases or broader human rights issues between East and West. Romania was strongly criticized for its refusal to work with other States within the framework of the mechanism, and Western countries expressed a desire to see future use of the mechanism lead to actual improvements in CSCE implementation.

The Paris meeting ended without adopting a concluding document. The United States and others questioned the need for one from the very beginning, since the meeting took place so soon after the adoption of the Vienna Concluding Document and while significant violations of that document were still taking place.

The Commission believes, Mr. Speaker, that the Paris meeting advanced our overall goal of fostering greater respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. While the Paris CDH Meeting was useful its success ultimately depends on the extent to which it will lead to improved compliance with CSCE provisions. As the Commission prepares for the next CDH meeting in Copenhagen, we will look for improved Soviet and East European compliance with the Helsinki Final Act and the Vienna and Madrid Concluding Documents. In particular, we expect the Soviet Union and others to live up to their commitment to find solutions to all outstanding human contacts cases within 6 months of the conclusion of the Vienna meeting. This deadline is set for mid-July. We will also continue to press for greater use of, and better response to, the human dimension mechanism, which can point to places where improvement is so desperately needed.

LET'S FIGHT CRIMINALS, NOT HONEST CITIZENS

HON. LARRY E. CRAIG

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the President's crime package contains many reforms I have long supported, including an enforceable Federal death penalty and tougher, mandatory penalties for violent crime.

However, there are two provisions that have no place in a crime control measure like this, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in working to remove them from the package.

The domestic assembly provisions of the bill could allow the Secretary of the Treasury to ban domestic manufacture of some firearms that are widely used by law-abiding citizens today. The section of the bill restricting gun clips and magazines is not only impractical and unworkable, but the kind of registration it contemplates has been considered and rejected by Congress.

These provisions do nothing to stop criminal violence, nothing to strengthen the hand of law enforcement and nothing to make this country a safer place to live. Instead, they create new problems for law-abiding citizens, new burdens for our police and prosecutors, and new restrictions on constitutional rights.

I'm happy to join the President's fight against criminals—not against honest citizens.

TRIBUTE TO ALAN M. KRANOWITZ

HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, in my three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, I have met many dedicated and talented individuals.

Some however stand out. One of these standouts is Alan M. Kranowitz, an individual who I am proud to call my friend.

I first met Alan in December 1984, shortly after being elected to the 99th Congress. At this time, Alan was working with our former colleague Tim Loeffler. In these early days and weeks in the House of Representatives, Alan provided me with guidance and counsel ranging from the idiosyncracies of the legislative process to office personnel matters. I was most fortunate to come to know a seasoned professional like Alan in my first few months in office.

My friend Alan Kranowitz has spent a majority of his adult life in public service working with such distinguished Members of the House of Representatives such as Tom Loeffler, BOB MICHEL, Dick Cheney, and Senator THOMAS J. DODD as well.

Certainly President Reagan and President Ford were well served by Alan's various responsibilities in the White House during his tours of duty at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. This institution and the Executive Branch miss his prowess, knowledge, and insight. When Alan Kranowitz left government this past March to enter the private sector, the public sector lost a vital and keenly sensitive man.

But, his family—his lovely wife Carol and his two fine sons David and Jeremy, will enjoy more time with their father and husband.

I for one miss his presence and advice. But, I am fortunate nevertheless in having had the opportunity to work with him. Moreover, the friendship that he and his family have provided me will remain always.

SMALL ISSUE DEVELOPMENT BOND PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES HATCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HATCHER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution calling for a 1-year extension of the Small Issue Development Bond [SIDB] Program. I believe that this program is the most effective Federal tool for assisting economic development efforts at the local level. State and local governments issue these tax-exempt bonds, and they are used to finance the construction of new manufacturing plants or expand existing businesses. Small issue bonds enable small- and medium-sized businesses to obtain capital at rates competitive with those charged to large corporations.

Our colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee are scheduled to consider expiring tax provisions on July 11 when we return from the July 4 recess. It is imperative that extension of this expiring tax provision be included in any 1989 tax legislation. Of all the tax provisions expiring at the end of 1989, the Small Issue Development Bond Program is the least expensive. Extension of this program represents a Federal revenue loss of only $7 million during fiscal year 1990.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many economic development programs eliminated or severely curtailed in recent years. The SIDB Program is a cost-effective means for stimulating job creation and economic growth in both rural and urban areas. Over 55 of my colleagues in both parties have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution, and I ask for the support of the rest of my colleagues in my effort to see an extension of this program included in 1989 tax legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO RICK AZAR

HON. BILL PAXON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding gentleman who has been a household name in western New York for three decades.

On Friday, Rick Azar will retire as sports director and anchor of WKBW-TV, the ABC affiliate in Buffalo, NY.

For the past 24 years, thousands of Buffalonians have tuned in to Eyewitness News every evening to get their report of the day's events from the longest running anchor team in American broadcast history.

I rise today not only to commend Rick Azar for his many years of professional accomplishment but to also pay tribute to Rick as a lifelong western New Yorker, a graduate, like me, of St. Joe's High School and Canisius College, and above all, a committed family man who has been deeply committed to improving the quality of life in his home town.

And, most importantly Rick, . . . anyone who has had to sit next to Irv Weinstein every night for the past 24 years certainly deserves high praise from the U.S. Congress!

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Rick Azar and wishing him continued health and happiness in his retirement.

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING WEEK

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, as of today, 345 of my colleagues have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 273, a bill I introduced on May 18, 1989, declaring January 7, 1990 through January 13, 1990, as "National Law Enforcement Training Week."

We all know the difficulty and hard work that goes into passing laws but we can only imagine the difficulty, hard work, and danger that goes into enforcing those laws. The dangers of law enforcement are evidenced by the fact that in the last 10 years 1,525 police officers have been killed, 204,584 have been injured and 590,822 have been assaulted. An even more frightening statistic is that every 57 hours another American law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty. Over the past 10 years the importance of law enforcement training has increased by incomprehensible measures as crime wars continue to rage. Drug kingpins and their cohorts are defending their crack with semiautomatic weapons and it is imperative that we give our law enforcement officers more than a fighting chance. Law enforcement training is our law enforcement professionals' tool against today's savage crimes. It teaches officers survival techniques so they can combat criminals in every possible setting and situation giving the officers a greater chance of coming out on top. The time has come for Congress to recognize and encourage the important role law enforcement trainers play in protecting our law officers so that they can continue to protect themselves as well as the law-abiding citizens of our country.

"Law Enforcement Training Week" would pay tribute to professionals, as well as emphasize the importance of the profession. Because law enforcement trainers are out of the public eye, they are rarely noticed and House Joint Resolution 273 would give them the attention they have earned and that they heartily deserve.

On June 9, 1989, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 137, the companion bill to House Joint Resolution 273 by voice vote. Today I urge all of my colleagues in the House to join me in voting for this most important commemorative, House Joint Resolution 273, "Law Enforcement Training Week."

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT GUN CONTROL STUDY

HON. TOMMY F. ROBINSON

OF ASKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act in the last Congress, we passed a measure introduced by Representative BILL MCCOLLUM, which directed the Department of Justice to conduct a study and to produce a list of options to prohibit ineligible persons from purchasing guns. On Monday that study was published in the Federal Register, and I am greatly disturbed by what is known as option B–2.

Under option B–2 the Justice Department would require that all Americans be issued a smart card. It is a standard identification card, like a driver's license, that would be electronically encoded with identification information such as fingerprints and prior police record. The smart cards would be updated with any information that would disqualify someone from purchasing a gun. The cards would be run through a reader at the gun shop to identify the buyer and inform the dealer if the buyer is eligible to purchase the weapon or not.

This concept is so radically different from anything we have had in the past that cost estimates are impossible. Every citizen would have to be issued a card, criminal justice agencies would need to be provided with the facilities to update these cards, gun dealers would have to be provided with readers for the cards, and a biometric data base for the Nation's entire population would have to be developed.

A national identification policy will be resisted by many people and rightfully so. National identification systems are Government attempts to control our lives and movements. This is the way of Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany. This is the way of minority rule in South Africa and their pass laws. Big Brother is coming to life. This is not the American way. What will be next—video cameras in our homes to make sure we do not mistreat our families. This policy is a ridiculous invasion of our privacy.

We must not let this policy go into effect but must search for other means to keep guns out of the hands of felons. We should get tough with those members of our society who use firearms to break the law and enforce the laws we already have which increase the penalties for crimes where a firearm is used. We should establish the death penalty for police killers and prosecute felons who are found to be in possession of a firearm. Let's get tough with those that break the law, and stop invading the privacy of law-abiding citizens.

ZAIRE AND TULANE UNIVERSITY: PIONEERING PARTNERS FOR HEALTH

HON. LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

OF LOUSIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, while President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire is making an official visit to Washington as a guest of President Bush, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the achievements and contributions of Tulane University's School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine in Zaire.

Tulane University with the assistance of the Government of Zaire and the United States Agency of International Development, has created the School of Public Health at the University of Kinshasa with the first class having graduated in 1987. The major objective of the project is to develop a fully accredited school of public health around the Department of Public Health in the University of Kinshasa Medical School, the primary Zairian training facility for medical personnel. The program enrolled 25 health professionals in its master's degree program in 1986, 23 in 1987, and 19 in 1988. Regular course offerings and continuing education courses include microcomputer technology, health and management information systems, planning, management and administration, applied research, statistics and epidemiology, demography, family and community health, and health education.

The Zaire School of Public Health's mission is to prepare a cadre of public health practitioners for leadership roles in Zaire and the Central African region. This need has long been established, and the situation is especially pressing in Zaire. Through the efforts of Tulane, the United States Agency for International Development, the University of Kinshasa, and the Government of Zaire, positive steps have been taken to achieve the World Health Organization's primary health care goal of "health for all by the year 2000."

Zaire is thought to have one of the highest rates of AIDS infection in the world. As such, AIDS research is a primary concern of the Zairian Government. Research efforts in the School of Public Health focus on applied investigations related to AIDS and child survival issues. Specialized facilities within the school include one of the largest public health libraries in French-speaking Africa, a modern microcomputer laboratory, public health laboratories for medical diagnosis, clinics and hospital services.

Tulane University is also working with the Centers of Disease Control to collect data on AIDS in Zaire. A $1 million contract with the U.S.A.I.D. will fund a program directed by Tulane which will introduce modern birth control practices in rural villages that are virtually isolated from modern medical facilities.

I am delighted to inform my colleagues of efforts being made in my home State which improve the quality of life everywhere. Tulane's involvement in Africa has grown steadily since the mid-1970's. In addition to its family planning and public health projects in Zaire, Tulane projects in Africa include developing inter-institutional linkages in Senegal, schistosomiasis research in Cameroon, a famine early warning system in six Sahelian countries (Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad and Sudan), policy and institutional reform in the health sector of Niger, health and information planning in Kenya, and food nutrition surveillance in Madagascar. Largely funded by the Agency for International Development, these projects represent significant economic gains in these developing nations.

I commend the efforts of Tulane University to develop innovative programs in the public health sector. The new Zaire School of Public Health provides a long-needed institutional foundation for state of the art training and research for a large region of the African continent.

HONORING CHRISTINA CHALUPA

HON. MARTY RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, remembering and understanding history is one of the most important ingredients for securing a bright future. Today I pay tribute to someone who has shown an understanding of the importance of history. Christina Chalupa participated in a map contest at school celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution which required students to design a map illustrating important aspects of early America. I am sure I join her teachers at the high school for agricultural science in the third District of Illinois in showing appreciation for her outstanding research in the commerce, navigation, and agriculture of early America. I wish to congratulate her for winning that competition and encourage her to continue her interest in and dedication to understanding the history of our country.

URGENT FUNDING NEEDED FOR MAINE STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES FOR PRESIDENTIAL SECURITY

HON. JOSEPH E. BRENNAN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BRENNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today calling for $160,000 to go to the State and local law enforcement agencies for the payment of additional necessary security services for President Bush during his visits to his Kennebunkport residence. These funds would be provided annually from fiscal years 1990 through 1993, or until the end of President Bush's term in the White House.

It is a great honor and privilege to have the President of the United States as a resident of the State of Maine. State, county, and local law enforcement officials are very proud to help meet the security needs of the President. However, the increased responsibility has placed a heavy financial burden on these departments, especially the smaller departments, which are already hard pressed for funds.

I believe it is only right that the Federal Government help these small local police departments with this assistance.

MSGR. JOHN B. GOLLAS

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize an individual who has given many years of service and devotion to the Johnstown, PA area. Msgr. John B. Gollas recently retired as pastor at St. Stephen's Church in Johnstown. His love and caring for the many individuals who have attended St. Stephen's has brought light into the lives of these people. Many of the parishioners of St. Stephen's have lived through the tough times that Johnstown has experienced, whether it was the disastrous 1977 flood or the severe economic downturns that our area has experienced. But Msgr. Gollas' faith and efforts have aided and comforted families not only in these difficult times, but also through many happy and joyous occasions.

Msgr. Gollas became assistant pastor at St. Stephen's in 1947, served there in that capacity through 1953, and returned to St. Stephen's as pastor in 1967. I am sure that his new status as pastor emeritus will keep him active in our community, but will also give him time to enjoy his retirement. If anyone has earned the opportunity to relax after so many years of service to his community, it is Msgr. Gollas. I wish him well, and thank him on behalf of the people of our area for his work in bettering the lives of all of us.

A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL "CHUB" DRAKULICH

HON. JAMES H. BILBRAY

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding citizen of Las Vegas, Michael "Chub" Drakulich. He is retiring after becoming the University of Nevada, Las Vegas' first athletic director in 1958. Chub built the foundation for what has become one of the most competitive intercollegiate athletic programs in the country. He is truly deserving of recognition.

Chub first joined UNLV in 1958 after being lured away from Rancho High School. Without a gym and only a $10,000 budget, he was asked to start a basketball program. His team, perhaps as a sign of the future, only got better. In 1963, however, Chub stepped down as head basketball coach and devoted his time to the school's newly formed baseball program. Soon other sports followed—cross country, track, golf, and football.

In 1973, Chub culminated his 15 years as athletic director, but continued at UNLV as golf coach and instructor in the physical education department.

During the early years of UNLV, many people had a vision that some day it would become a major university. Chub Drakulich was one of them. This man, who was my own teacher and coach, worked very hard to help realize this vision and make UNLV what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me today in honoring Mr. Chub Drakulich. His contributions to UNLV as its first athletic director, basketball and baseball coach have earned him respect and recognition throughout the State as one of Nevada's finest citizens.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RECOGNIZES LUCY KNOWLES

HON. BUTLER DERRICK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all of my colleagues are aware of President Bush's call for promotion of volunteer activities through a "Points of Light Foundation." In view of this call, I am pleased to announce that Ms. Lucy Knowles has been recognized by the Department of Energy as an exceptional employee for her outstanding volunteer service in the Aiken community.

An attorney at the Savannah River Site's office of chief counsel, Ms. Knowles serves as president of the Family Counseling Service of Aiken. She also volunteers as a community arbitrator for the second judicial circuit solicitor's office.

In her position as community arbitrator, Ms. Knowles guides first-time juvenile offenders through an innovative program that includes the child, the family, the victim, and the law enforcement officer. In addition, Ms. Knowles has provided free legal services to abused women. I am well aware of the work that Ms. Knowles has done for the Aiken community. Her dedication to civic affairs is an inspiration to us all.

It is through volunteers such as Ms. Knowles that Americans are recovering one of their greatest assets: families. I salute her for her efforts.

MISSISSIPPI DEEP SEA FISHING RODEO PAYS TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN POW'S, MIA'S

HON. LARKIN I. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to a model of community spirit and achievement, and to a special tribute to our American former prisoners of war and our men still classified as missing in action.

The model of community achievement is the Mississippi Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo. Since its creation in 1947, through the cooperative efforts of citizens of Gulfport, MS, and their neighbors on the Mississippi gulf coast, this rodeo has grown to become known as the world's largest fishing rodeo. This annual event is truly a highlight for the Mississippi gulf coast and the Southeastern United States.

This year, I am proud to report, the rodeo is dedicated to our former prisoners of war and MIA's. These veterans have truly tasted the bitter absence of freedom that they have fought to preserve for all of us.

Let us join with those patriotic citizens who will celebrate the 41st annual Mississippi Deep Sea Fishing Rodeo on June 30 through Independence Day, July 4th, in this fitting tribute and expression of appreciation for these

veterans who have served their country with tremendous sacrifice.

TRIBUTE TO B.F. "BEN" WHITTINGTON

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that for nearly 40 years, Mr. B.F. "Ben" Whittington of Brunswick, MD, has been a bright spot in the working day of many Washington bureaucrats, including congressional staff. As a conductor and trainman on the MARC commuter system, Ben has faithfully and cheerfully greeted his supporters and lifted their spirits as they begin and end their workday in the Nation's Capital. Although not himself an expert in Government matters, Ben has the unique ability to understand complex issues of foreign and domestic affairs, and to simplify problems in a down-home style of his own that intrigues his passengers. Ben was never content to be just a ticket "puncher"; he envisioned and successfully accomplished a much broader mission, that of bringing laughter and friendship to his passengers.

I am proud to have Ben as one of my constituents, and join with his many friends and admirers in wishing him a healthy and peaceful retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES O'CONNOR

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, the men and women who comprise the police departments around our Nation perform acts of heroism on a daily basis. For the most part, they go about their tasks with little notice or gratitude. Every now and then, however, police officers go beyond the call of duty and show all of us why we should be thankful that these men and women are willing to serve our communities.

A police officer from the High Point, NC, Police Department recently performed a feat of true courage, and I would like to share his story with you. His name is James O'Connor, and on June 7, 1989, Officer O'Connor saved a woman's life. The disturbed woman was trying to kill herself, but thanks to his valiant efforts, the woman is alive today.

O'Connor was driving his patrol car down Main Street in High Point about 8:40 p.m. on Wednesday, June 7, when he noticed a woman standing on the bridge sidewalk with her head bowed. He circled his patrol car and was approaching the woman again when three teen-age boys told him they thought she was going to leap from the bridge. As he got out of his car, the woman climbed over the safety railing, facing Main Street with her back to the railroad tracks.

As a train roared by, the woman began to jump, and Officer O'Connor grabbed her. He was only able to grab her hair and her right arm, and he slipped more than halfway over the safety railing himself. As she struggled to get away from him, Officer O'Connor managed to hook his leg through the railing. They hung over the railing with the train passing below until the three teenagers assisted Officer O'Connor in pulling the woman to safety. He told the High Point Enterprise, "I don't know why I grabbed her. But when I grabbed her, I knew I had to pull her up. It's just the type of thing that happens. There's no planning for it, you have to act."

The true acts of courage require no planning. You either act or you don't. In Officer Jim O'Connor's case, he acted quickly and without thought to his own safety. He saved a troubled person who wanted to end her life, and he did so by risking his own. I do not know Officer O'Connor personally, but I am sure he would not classify himself as a hero. In my mind, however, he is a true American hero.

Perhaps the most unsung heroes in this tale were the three teenagers who aided Officer O'Connor in his daring act. During the commotion that followed this incident, they quietly slipped away. We don't know their names, but we are proud that they call High Point, NC, home. Thanks to them and Officer Jim O'Connor a troubled young woman will get a second chance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in business on the floor of the House of Representatives on June 27 and 28, 1989, for medical reasons. Had I been present, however, I would have voted in the following manner on these rollcall votes:

Vote No. 109, "nay."
Vote No. 112, "nay."
Vote No. 113, "yea."
Vote No. 114, "nay."
Vote No. 115, "yea."
Vote No. 117, "nay."
Vote No. 118, "nay."
Vote No. 119, "yea."
Vote No. 120, "yea."
Vote No. 121, "yea."
Vote No. 122, "nay."
Vote No. 123, "yea."

LEFFERTS HUTTON'S LEGACY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, from the time I ran for Congress more than a dozen years ago, and in every election since, my constituents have urged me to do everything I could to preserve our Nation's heritage of open space, clean air, and pure water.

Over the years, no voice was more consistent or stronger in expressing that view than that of my good friend, Lefferts Hutton. Long before I came along, indeed long before most Americans had given the issue much thought, Leff was a nationally recognized pioneer in the environmental protection movement stressing the dangers of our throwaway society and promoting alternatives to many of our careless and polluting methods of industrial production and waste disposal.

Among the enormous number of environmental projects he undertook along with his wife Ginny, Leff in 1968 founded the Hutton Recycling Center, a volunteer recycling program and environmental information service. In 1977, both Leff and Ginny were selected by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to be part of the U.N. Environmental Program's International Referral System. The referral service was set up to handle inquiries on environmental problems around the world. Throughout the years, the Huttons worked in almost every State and in Canada to promote recycling centers and environmental education.

Somehow, Leff also found time to serve as chairman of the Bucks County Audubon Society's recycling committee from 1970 to 1978, to serve as a proud member of the U.S. Army Reserve from 1942 to 1972, during which time he saw 5 years of active duty, and to work as an executive in the Goodall Rubber Co., of Trenton, NJ until his retirement in 1978.

It is with great sadness that I rise today to acknowledge the passing of Leff Hutton and to thank him for his service to the citizens of Bucks County, the citizens of the United States and the people of the World. Leff was a man who was ahead of his time, and it is sad that only now are we in Congress beginning to tackle the environmental problems that Leff battled for some many years.

I will miss Leff, his friendship, and his wise counsel, and I know many Members of Congress join me in expressing sympathies to Ginny as well as all Leff's family.

A TRIBUTE TO MISS BRIDGET ASAY AND MISS JAMIE HUBBARD

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize two outstanding, dedicated, and extremely able interns who have successfully completed their internships in my Washington congressional office.

Miss Bridget Asay of Toms River, NJ, and Miss Jamie Hubbard of Basking Ridge, NJ, have both been of assistance to myself and my staff in helping to serve the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey. It was my pleasure to have Miss Asay and Miss Hubbard in my office, and I hope that they were able to derive not only an educational benefit but a level of personal satisfaction from their internships.

Miss Asay is currently a student at Harvard University, and Miss Hubbard attends high school in Basking Ridge. I wish both of them continued success in their studies, and I also

want to extend my sincere wishes to Bridget and Jamie for a successful, happy, and healthy future.

HYDRILLA-GRASS CARP PROGRAM

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to congratulate the members of the Imperial Irrigation District Hydrilla/Grass Carp Program. On June 7, 1989, they were honored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture with a Distinguished Service Award. The program participants who received the award include Dr. Randall K. Stoker, program director, Neal R. Hagstram and Michael D. Remington, biologists, J. Robert Wilson, water department manager, and Claude Finnell, former Imperial County Agricultural Commissioner.

Their work is of great importance because they have been able to successfully control the hydrilla aquatic weed problem that restricts the State's water flow in irrigation and drainage channels.

Hydrilla was first found in the All-American Canal in 1977 and since then it has become the IID's most serious water weed problem ever. Its high growth rate necessitates the constant removal of the weed. Mechanical methods proved expensive and temporary, while chemical means were found to be harmful to the environment and the drinking water.

In 1985, after 3 years of research, the district team introduced a sterile grass carp that would not endanger the native fish populations, yet would consume the hydrilla weed and eradicate the problem. The high stocking rate of fish resulted in a 95-percent removal of all hydrilla in the IID's water delivery system.

The program has been so successful, it is now being used in the northern Mexico irrigation system, and several irrigation districts in the United States have expressed an interest in developing a similar program.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the award winners for their outstanding achievements in finding creative solutions to the conservation of our vital resources.

OPENING OF AN ARTISTIC DISCOVERY: THE CONGRESSIONAL ARTS COMPETITION

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the opening of "An Artistic Discovery," the Congressional Arts Caucus' national art exhibition and awards ceremony for high school artists. Today's opening is unique for several reasons, and I believe the key to its uniqueness lies in its title—specifically, in the word "discovery."

To "discover," according to Webster's, means "to obtain sight or knowledge of for the first time," and also, "to make known or visible." Accordingly, today's festivities are the result of a long and concerted effort, on the part of 255 Members of Congress and their staff, to obtain knowledge of their districts' most outstanding young artists, and to make their artwork visible to the Capital and to the Nation. In implementing this arts competition, we Members of Congress have gained new insight into the hearts and minds of America's youth. And inviting the young artists here to Capitol Hill, we hope they will learn a little more about the people who will be admiring their artwork during the months to come. So, on one level, this celebration represents a dialog of discovery between and among legislators and artists. I think we can learn a lot from each other.

This process of discovery, however, was set into motion even before the Congressional Arts Competition got underway. Ample credit must also be given to the winners' parents and teachers, who recognized the talents their students or children possess, and encouraged them to share their special gifts with the rest of us. In many other nations, institutions like school and family—not to mention government—are far too frequently associated with the active discouragement of self-expression. By contrast, the support of the parents and teachers here today has enabled families and schools to function as places of discovery: places where self-expression is encouraged, creativity nurtured, artistic vision allowed to flourish.

This artistic vision is the final, and certainly the most important, element of discovery involved in today's festivities. As you look upon the artwork of these students, new worlds will begin to unfold your eyes. Innovative choices of subject matter, bold juxtapositions of color and line, imaginative explorations of various media—these are the predominant characteristics of the winning artwork. Such boldness, innovation, and vision, moreover, are the qualities of leadership. As their presence on Capitol Hill suggests, today's young artists are tomorrow's leaders. With their talent and imagination, the young men and women here today have the potential to shape the future: to obtain sight of new territory, and to make this territory visible to the rest of us. For this reason, these young artists deserve our ongoing attention, support, and respect. By continuing to foster a spirit of artistic discovery in our young people, we stand only to gain—as individuals, and as a nation.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 of this year, the Ukrainian Cultural Center of Warren, MI, will be honoring the Restoration of Ukrainian Independence, which took place on June 20, 1941. Today I would like to commemorate this most significant day in Ukrainian history. All Ukrainians also remember that on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainians originally declared to the world their liberty and independence.

Although, by 1921, the people of the Ukraine were the subjects of a violent invasion by the Soviet Red Army, their brief rendezvous with independence is recognized as a symbol to all of their persistence and dedication to freedom.

The history of the Ukrainians is one of repression. They have long been denied even the most basic freedoms that we, as Americans, all too often take for granted.

Ever since the brutal occupation of their beloved homeland 68 years ago, then again 23 years ago, Ukrainians worldwide have gathered annually to rejoice in their short-lived triumph, hopeful that it will come again.

Today, I propose that we honor them, for their endless sufferance, their dignity, their contributions to humankind of rich heritage and passionate traditions, and, most of all, for their message of hope and faith that someday, God willing, freedom will once again reign over their peaceful territory.

REMINING AND RECLAMATION OF ABANDONED MINE LANDS

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 29, 1989

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, after many months of careful consideration and negotiations, I rise today to introduce legislation to encourage the reclamation of abandoned, previously mined coal lands. This is one of the pleasant instances where the environmental community and the coal industry agree that a change in the law is needed. While some aspects of the legislation will require further refinement in the effort to achieve complete agreement among the interested parties, the bill which I offer today provides a framework within which millions of acres of orphaned coal lands can be reclaimed.

We estimate that there are 13 million acres of abandoned mined land, which was mined and abandoned without reclamation prior to 1977, the year in which the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act [SMCRA] was enacted. Over its life, the Abandoned Mine Land [AML] fund, established by SMCRA to restore orphaned lands, will collect $3 billion, only one-tenth of the money necessary to relaim all of the abandoned mine lands. To date, only about 56,000 acres have been reclaimed. The current and future anticipated size of the fund is woefully inadequate to meet the existing orphaned land reclamation needs.

My bill would leverage the fund by providing financial incentives to operators so that in the process of remining, an appropriate degree of reclamation will occur. Last year I established a working group of industry and environmental representatives and State and Federal regulators. We agreed on both the general need for legislation and the kind of incentives that would be necessary to encourage remining. But we did not have time to complete our work before the 100th Congress adjourned.

Today's legislation is offered with the interest of rekindling these discussions which I believe can result in the passage of a remining initiative this year.

This measure includes a menu of financial incentives from which a mining operator may select a sufficient number to allow remining to take place. They are a waiver of the AML fees operators pay when coal is remined; some alternative form of bonding which will relieve operators of the burden of paying expensive bond premiums; a bonding credit pool that enables remining operators to obtain bonding credits which may be applied to virgin sites, and as a last resort, direct financial payments.

The bill also terminates the liability of remining operators for conditions that exist on the site when the remining operator enters. In essence, we will not continue to hold the remining operator responsible for damage caused by the original operator. The operator, however, may not allow conditions on the site to worsen.

And, under the bill, the operator may use soil from a first cut to cover toxic materials on an adjacent already mined area. In these instances, the operator will receive relief from the requirement that the first cut highwall be remined to the appropriate original contour. He must, however, use all spoil not needed for toxic material covering for highwall elimination.

The operator will select a mix of these incentives and propose a package along with the permit application. Incentives will be awarded only to the extent necessary to encourage the remining activity.

The remining permit itself would be issued only by the State regulatory authority. If the operator is seeking remining incentives, joint approval of the incentives part only by the State authority and the Office of Surface Mining will be required.

I have included a procedure to facilitate the review, which I intend to be conducted simultaneously by the State and OSM. This review will have a two step process. Within 60 days of the request, the operator will be given an advisory opinion by the State regulatory agency and OSM that the site (a) is likely to qualify, (b) may qualify, or (c) will not qualify. This opinion can be obtained with very little investment on the part of the operator. If the opinion is favorable, then a full permit application and application for incentives can be made.

OSM will be required to develop a formula for determining the cost to the AML fund of each incentive. Then, if more applications for incentives are received than moneys appropriated to the fund in a given year can justify, a priority of projects will be constructed.

The passage of this legislation is needed to assure the reclamation of abandoned surface mined lands nationwide. I look forward to the Subcommittee on Mining and Natural Resources' hearing on this bill so that we may continue our dialog among the members of the mining and the environmental communities. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. FINDING.

Section 101 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 120) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (i) through (k) as paragraphs (j) through (l) and by inserting after paragraph (h) the following new paragraph:

"(i) surface coal mining operations can achieve the reclamation of abandoned mined lands, the remining of which should be encouraged to maximize recovery of remaining coal resources and to maximize reclamation of abandoned mined lands in the process.".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

Section 102 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (i) through (m) as paragraphs (j) through (n) and by inserting after paragraph (h) the following new paragraph:

"(i) encourage the reclamation of abandoned mined lands by active surface coal mine operators;".

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 201(c) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1211) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (13) as paragraphs (6) through (14) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) administer the programs authorized by this Act to promote the reclamation of abandoned mined lands by qualified surface coal mining operators;".

SEC. 4. USE OF MONEYS IN ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND.

Section 401(c) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1231) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (10) as paragraphs (9) through (11) and inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"(8) to carry out the purposes and programs of title X;".

SEC. 5. RECLAMATION FEE.

Section 402(a) of the Surface Mining control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1232) is amended by deleting the period at the end of the subsection, inserting a colon, and adding the following at the end of the section: *"Provided, however,* That the Secretary in the interest of conserving natural resources and promoting reclamation of unreclaimed areas, and for furtherance of the purposes of this Act, shall have the authority by regulation to waive or reduce the reclamation fee imposed under this section for qualified persons engaged in remining activities approved pursuant to title X.".

SEC. 6. REMINING OF PREVIOUSLY MINED AREAS.

"(a) NEW TITLE.—The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new title as follows:

"TITLE X—REMINING OF PREVIOUSLY MINED AREAS

"SEC. 1001. COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE V.

"Any person who plans to mine a previously mined area shall comply with all standards, requirements and procedures set forth in title V, except as set forth in this title.

"SEC. 1002. DEFINITIONS

"As used in this title:

"(1) The term 'previously mined area' means any area disturbed by coal mining activity prior to August 3, 1977.

"(2) The term 'qualified applicant' means an applicant for environmental or financial incentives under this title who has been determined by the Director of the Office to have an outstanding record of mining and reclamation of mined land in the United States, according to standards developed by that office.

"SEC. 1003. ELIGIBILITY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Only the qualified applicants, as defined in this title, may be eligible for the remining incentives authorized under this title. The Secretary, by regulation, shall establish standards and procedures for determining eligibity.

"(b) MOUNTAIN TOP REMOVAL.—No application can be approved or any incentive awarded under this title for any project which uses in whole or in part mountain top removal as a method of extraction.

"SEC. 1004. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) INCENTIVES.—A qualified applicant who plans to mine a previously mined area may submit as part of the permit application required by section 510 a request for specific environmental incentives or financial incentives or both, at the applicant's option.

"(b) FINANCIAL INCENTIVES.—

"(1) INCENTIVES AVAILABLE.—If an applicant submits an application for financial incentives to remine a previously mined area, the applicant may select one or more of the following incentives: (A) bond guarantee, (B) bond credits, (C) direct financial payment, or (D) waiver of the AML fee for coal produced in remining the previously mined area.

"(2) STATEMENT BY APPLICANT..—The applicant shall state why an incentive, and the level of incentive, sought is necessary to cause the remining to occur, and shall provide adequate documentation to support the request.

"(c) ENVIRONMENTAL INCENTIVES.—

"(1) INCENTIVES AVAILABLE.—Any qualified applicant who seeks an environmental incentive to remine a previously mined area may select one or both of the following incentives: (A) termination of liability and (B) disposal of spoil in adjacent toxic areas. The termination of liability provision shall be available only in circumstances where the applicant anticipates mining a previously mined area on which he will encounter toxic-producing materials or produce acid discharge.

"(2) TERMINATION OF LIABILITY.—If a qualified applicant seeks to terminate liability for his remining activities under this title, and that application is approved, each of the following conditions shall apply:

"(A) Liability for any and all actions taken during the mining or reclamation process and for the consequences or effects of the remining activity shall terminate only when the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority determine that the person has complied with all requirements of the approved permit and mining and reclamation plan required by the Act, implementing regulations, and approved State program.

"(B) Only when the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority determine that the operator has complied with the permit and mining and reclamation plan requirements, can the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority terminate the person's liability for the site. When liability of the permittee is terminated, the fund shall assume responsibility for the site, including liability for claims by affected third parties under this Act or other law. Once the fund assumes responsibility for the site, the Director of the Office shall consider further reclamation of the site under normal AML priorities, except that,

in no case, may the Director of the Office allow the environmental conditions on or off site to worsen, or fall below conditions existing prior to the remining activity approved under this title.

"(C) The Secretary shall promulgate any regulations necessary to implement and administer this provision.

"(d) SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FOR INCENTIVES.—The applicant shall submit an application for financial or environmental incentives, or both, to both the Office of Surface Mining and the State regulatory authority, and the concurrence of both shall be required for approval of any incentive under this title. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to require approval by the Director of the Office of the permit application, as distinct from the application for incentives.

"(e) REVIEW PROCEDURE.—The Director of the Office shall establish by regulation an efficient and prompt procedure for reviewing applications under this title and for rendering a decision approving, modifying, or rejecting such applications. These procedures shall provide for the following 2-state review process:

"(1) A qualified applicant may request a preliminary determination by the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority that the proposed remining activity is in a 'previously mined area' and therefore eligible for incentives under this title, and a preliminary determination that the proposed project will (A) not qualify; (B) may qualify; or (C) is likely to qualify for incentives. This decision, which is advisory in nature, shall be made within 60 days of submission of the request to the Office and the State regulatory authority of the proposed project and other competing projects under this title and shall be made upon consideration of its priority.

"(2) Upon receipt of the preliminary determination, or at any time if no preliminary determination is sought, a qualified person may submit an application for incentives, along with a permit application which complies with all title V procedures and meets all title V requirements. Review and processing of the application for incentives shall proceed simultaneously with the processing of the title V permit application; however, any financial and environmental incentives sought under this title shall be granted only upon the approval of both the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority.

"SEC. 1005. APPROVAL STANDARDS.

"(a) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OR MODIFICATION.—The Director of the Office and the State shall, following public participation and other procedures established by regulation, approve, disapprove, or modify an incentive proposed by the applicant. The Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority may require any additional information they deem necessary to render a decision on the application, or discuss with the qualified applicant the level or nature of any requested incentive.

"(b) STANDARD.—The applications for financial or environmental incentives under this title shall be evaluated and approved by the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority based on their determination that the proposed project will result in significant environmental benefit with the least possible cost or exposure to the fund. As a condition for the award of incentives under this title, the Director of the Office and the State regulatory authority shall have first determined that the proposed project would not proceed without the approval level of incentive.

"(c) RANKING.—If more applications from qualified applicants for remining incentives are received in a fiscal year than can be approved under the appropriated level of expenditure for that year, the Director of the Office shall rank the projects and approve for incentives those that provide the most environmental benefit with the least cost or liability to the fund.

"SEC. 1006. ESTABLISHMENT OF FORMULA TO DETERMINE EXPOSURE OF AML FUND.

"The Secretary shall establish by regulation a formula for determining the cost or exposure to the fund for each financial and environmental incentive, and shall apply that formula to each remining application submitted under this title. The Secretary shall provide to Congress quarterly a report which lists each project approved, all pending applications, any liability and costs incurred on the part of the fund for approved projects, and the requested incentives for pending applications.

"SEC. 1007. ENVIRONMENTAL INCENTIVES.

"(a) TERMINATION OF LIABILITY.—In cases where the applicant proposes a termination of liability for a mining operation, the applicant shall in his section 508 mining and reclamation plan and in his permit application specify the steps that he plans to take in the handling of toxic materials and acid water, in assuring revegetation of the site and in returning the land to a viable postmining land use in accordance with title V requirements. The applicant shall further specify how he plans to meet the requirements of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

"(b) USE OF SPOIL.—In cases where the applicant proposes to use spoil generated by the remaining operation to cover toxic materials on adjacent areas, and not enough spoil exists or will be generated to cover the adjacent toxic materials and to eliminate the highwall on the previously mined area and return the mined land to approximate original contour, the applicant shall submit documentation of the existence of toxic materials in adjacent areas, and his plan for utilizing spoil created by the remaining operation to cover toxic materials. The toxic materials shall be covered with no more spoil than is necessary to eliminate the toxic-related problems, and the applicant shall use the remainder of the spoil to backfill the highwall to the maximum extent possible.

"SEC. 1008. EXTRACTION OF COAL IN AML PROJECTS.

"(a) PROPOSAL TO RECLAIM.—Any qualified person may submit to the Office a proposal to extract coal during reclamation of a 'previously mined area' within the purview of title IV of this Act.

"(b) APPROVAL.—The Director of the Office may approve the application if it meets applicable title IV standards; except that in no case shall the value of the coal extracted exceed 10 percent of the cost of the estimated reclamation project. In cases in which coal extraction is projected to exceed 10 percent of the estimated cost of reclamation, the applicant must submit a title V permit application and otherwise meet all title V standards and requirements.

"(c) STANDARDS UNDER TITLE IV.—Any project approved under this section shall be subject to the standards and requirements normally applicable to title IV projects.

"SEC. 1009. RESEARCH ON REMINING EQUIPMENT.

"Not more than $2,000,000 for a fiscal year may be made available from the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund for research on remining equipment.

"SEC. 1010. REGULATIONS.

"The Secretary shall promulgate such regulations as are necessary and proper to administer the provisions contained in this title.".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents contained in the first section of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 is amended by adding the following items at the end thereof:

"Sec. 1001. Compliance with title V.
"Sec. 1002. Definitions.
"Sec. 1003. Eligibility.
"Sec. 1004. Application requirements.
"Sec. 1005. Approval standards.
"Sec. 1006. Establishment of formula to determine exposure of AML fund.
"Sec. 1007. Environmental incentives.
"Sec. 1008. Extraction of coal in AML projects.
"Sec. 1009. Research on remining equipment.
"Sec. 1010. Regulations.