

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 25, 1987

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Reverend John Pakalniskis, Church of the Annunciation, Brooklyn, NY, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, we gather here to commemorate the 69th anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. We bow before You in reverent and heartfelt homage, rededicating ourselves to the Gospel we accepted 600 years ago, because Your Word alone fosters peace, unity, and love.

Forty-six years ago our beloved homeland of Lithuania lost her cherished independence, becoming yet another tragic victim of Soviet imperialism. Therefore we pray to You, O most merciful Father:

For all who suffer persecution for the sake of the Gospel;

For all those imprisoned and exiled or otherwise deprived of human rights and dignity;

For those who have offered the supreme sacrifice of their lives for the cause of these freedoms and truths.

We thank You, Father, for the years of freedom which Lithuania has enjoyed since the year 1253, when she joined the family of nations. We bow in deep respect before all who gave their lives, energy, and talent in the service of our land.

Bless, Father, the Members of Congress here assembled and all the people of this beautiful country.

Support our efforts, dear Lord, to pass on the life and liberty we enjoy here to our beloved Lithuania. Give us the strength and prudence to preserve and uphold freedom and independence. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

REV. JOHN LEONARD PAKALNISKIS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to welcome to our Nation's Capital, the Reverend John Leonard Pakalniskis, pastor of the Church of the Annunciation in Brooklyn, NY, who offered the opening prayer.

Father Pakalniskis is currently the supreme chaplain to the Lithuanian Scouts Organization, as well as the vice president of the Lithuanian Priests' League of the United States.

He was born in New York City, and when he was 6 years old in 1921, Father Pakalniskis moved with his parents to Lithuania, where he completed his education. Ordained to the priesthood on June 3, 1939, Father Pakalniskis also graduated from the University of Vytautas the Great in Kaunas, Lithuania, that same year. His first assignment was the assistant at the Cathedral Church in Kaunas, where he also taught religious courses.

On June 7, 1947, Father Pakalniskis came to the United States, and served as assistant pastor to three parishes in Brooklyn, until July 16, 1978, when he was appointed the pastor of the Annunciation Church.

I want to thank Father Pakalniskis for being with us today, and to wish him continuing success in his dedicated work in the church.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SELECTION OF REPUBLICAN OBSERVERS TO STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TALKS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the agreement between the House and Senate joint congressional leadership, I am pleased to announce that the following Republican Members of the House will be observers to the strategic arms reduction talks:

Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan;
Mr. DICKINSON of Alabama;
Mr. LOTT of Mississippi;
Mr. LAGOMARSINO of California;
Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri;
Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma;
Mr. COURTER of New Jersey;
Ms. SNOWE of Maine;
Mr. DORNAN of California; and
Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH PROPOSAL

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the President's proposal to provide catastrophic health care coverage under Medicare for older Americans; 24 other Members are joining us as cosponsors.

The President's proposal addresses a need which I think all of us acknowledge exists to one degree or another. At present, some 54,000 older Americans have hospital stays longer than the 60 days covered by Medicare. Some 1.3 million incur health expenses in excess of \$2,000 a year.

Some of these costs are covered by private, so-called MediGap, insurance policies, but some are not. If all the MediGap policies provided catastrophic coverage, we would have no problem. But they do not, which is why we are introducing this legislation.

The President's proposal would provide unlimited hospital days and medical care, and would ensure that no one would have to pay more than \$2,000 out-of-pocket annually for services covered by Medicare. This catastrophic coverage would be financed through an increase in the part B premium of \$4.92 a month.

The advantage of this approach is that it spreads the financing across the entire Medicare population, thus reducing the cost per person; it does not add to the budget deficit; and most importantly, it will provide peace of mind for some 30 million elderly that they will not be bankrupted by a serious illness.

The legislation does not, of course, provide a solution for the problem of long-term, or nursing home, care which is becoming an overwhelming burden on more and more of our elderly citizens, particularly as our population ages and people are living longer.

I have established a Republican Task Force on Health, under the chairmanship of BILL GRADISON, and one of the things I have asked it to consider is the issue of long-term care. There are no immediate or easy solutions, but the issue must be addressed.

Meanwhile, the President has proposed a responsible solution for our acute care problem, and I hope it receives early action.

□ 1410

ARMS SALES TO IRAN AND THE PRESIDENT'S MEMORY

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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the President, I think that he misphrased a question yesterday dealing with the problem of arms sales to Iran and his own memory. He asked if everybody could remember what they were doing on August 8, 1985.

Well, his method of asking other people to test the hypothesis is reasonable, but he asked the wrong question, because it is not what you were doing on a particular date, but did he authorize an arms sale to Iran. So following his example, I thought that we might further test his hypothesis, and I would hope that anybody here who remembers authorizing an arms sale to Iran within the last couple years would raise their hands.

Then, would everybody who remembers not authorizing an arms sale to Iran raise their hands.

Then, would everybody who cannot remember whether or not they authorized an arms sale to Iran raise their hands.

Well, apparently we have people on all sides, which gives us the principle of constitutional equality with the executive branch, because the President in his report to the Tower Commission first said that he remembered authorizing it, then he said he remembered not authorizing it, and then he said that he did not remember. So insofar as we have people who remembered authorizing it, remembered not, and not remembering, we have I think done something to establish constitutional equality with the President, and a blow is struck for the Constitution.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO SUSPEND MFN STATUS FOR ROMANIA

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today Mr. WOLF and Mr. HALL join me in introducing a bill to suspend most favored nation status for Romania for 6 months because of ongoing, pervasive violation of human rights in that country. This legislation is similar to a proposal we offered in the last Congress that enjoyed broad, bipartisan support and 95 cosponsors in the House.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways, Romania is a paradox. It has demonstrated an ability to chart its own foreign policy rather than dance to the tune of Soviet hegemony. Encouraging as this independent streak may be, the fact of the matter is that on the domestic front, Romania continues to repress and to circumscribe the fundamental rights of its citizens.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Romania signed the Helsinki accords in 1975 and claims it is committed to fulfilling its obligations under the act. Their

record of compliance to the international covenant, however, does not match their rhetoric. It seems that the dark cloud of repression is lifted somewhat only during our Government's annual review of MFN. Last year over 1,000 backlogged emigration cases were solved and some leading prisoners of conscience were liberated in the spring and early summer. But when MFN seems assured for another year, Romania lapses back into old habits—churches are again bulldozed, religious believers harassed, and other state controls imposed.

It is sad but true that the Romanian Government tolerates no domestic criticism, no opposition, no dissent from its policies. There are massive controls of all forms of the media, freedom of speech, and movement within and without the country. Furthermore, citizens are prohibited the right to assemble unless specific permission is granted by the Government. Of course, that permission is only secured when the Government has ensured that the activity will serve the interests of the Communist Party. Christians are singled out for arrest and imprisonment.

The bill we are introducing today sends a clear message to the Romanians that respect for human rights is the cornerstone of United States-Romanian relations, and is the key to enhanced trade, friendship, and understanding between our two countries. What we seek is year round—not periodic—compliance with the Helsinki accords and the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. YATES of Illinois;
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida;
Mr. SOLARZ of New York;
Mr. GARCIA of New York; and
Mr. GREEN of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), Public Law 86-380, the Chair appoints as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. WEISS of New York; and
Mr. LIGHTFOOT of Iowa.

APPOINTMENT AS ADDITIONAL MEMBER OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a) the Chair appoints as an additional member of the Joint Economic Committee the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLARZ.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a), Public Law 98-399, as amended by Public Law 99-284, the Chair appoints as members of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Federal Holiday Commission, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania;
Mr. DYMALLY of California;
Mr. REGULA of Ohio; and
Mr. KEMP of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b), Public Law 93-191, the Chair appoints as members of the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards the following Members of the House:

Mr. UDALL of Arizona, chairman;
Mr. SOLARZ of New York;
Mr. FORD of Michigan;
Mr. FRENZEL of Minnesota;
Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri; and
Mr. LEWIS of California.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION TO ATTEND 28TH MEETING OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 276d, the Chair appoints as members of the United States delegation to attend the 28th meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut, chairman;
Mr. FASCELL of Florida, vice chairman;
Mr. GIBBONS of Florida;
Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana;
Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota;
Mr. AU COIN of Oregon;
Mr. PENNY of Minnesota;
Mr. BROOMFIELD of Michigan;
Mr. HORTON of New York;
Mr. STANGELAND of Minnesota;
Mr. MARTIN of New York; and
Mr. MILLER of Washington.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL REPUBLICAN OBJECTORS FOR THE CONSENT CALENDAR AND THE PRIVATE CALENDAR FOR THE 100TH CONGRESS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce the official objectors for the Republican side for the 100th Congress:

For the Consent Calendar, our official objectors will be the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, the gentleman from California, Mr. LUNGREN, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. WORTLEY.

For the Private Calendar our official objectors will be the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. DeWINE, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GEKAS.

HOLD GATES APPOINTMENT TO CIA DIRECTORSHIP

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

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, in each new day and each mysterious new way the plot thickens in trying to unravel what has transpired in Irangate, but the basic question that has to be answered is, "When Congress passes a law, are indeed all Americans responsible for obeying it?" Indeed, in this case is a Government agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and its officials, obliged to obey the law like everyone else?

Today my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and I will be circulating a letter asking the Senate to hold Mr. Gates' appointment as the new Director of the CIA in abeyance until a complete investigation as to his involvement in the Iranian-Contragate affair is concluded. We do not believe it appropriate that the newest head of what was clearly one of the most deeply involved, intimately involved agencies of this Government be confirmed until it is ascertained that his hands are clean.

We are especially concerned about what Mr. Gates knew of the CIA's covert involvement that may have been in violation of the Boland amendment. Because of what has happened it is clear that rather than sully the record further, it is best that Mr. Gates step down, the President stand back, and let the investigation go forward.

MICHAEL HARRIS, HOUSTON'S "TOP JOCK"

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

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure recently to join one of my

constituents, Michael Harris, on his talk show on radio station KCOH in Houston.

In November, Mr. Harris was voted Houston's "Top Jock" in a contest sponsored by the Houston Chronicle. The purpose of the contest, in which Chronicle readers voted for their favorite radio personalities, was to raise funds for charities of the radio personalities' choice. Mr. Harris' designated charity was the SHAPE (Self-Help for African People Through Education) Community Center of Houston, which offers tutorial programs for young people and adults and provides computer training and job placement assistance.

Because Mr. Harris won the "Top Jock" contest, the SHAPE Community Center of Houston received a check in the amount of \$10,000 that it will use to carry out its worthy activities that benefit men and women throughout the Houston area.

Mr. Harris, although only 34, is a veteran radio personality who enjoys great respect and a loyal following among Houston-area radio listeners. He began his career at Houston radio station KYOK in 1972, before moving on to radio station KIKK, where he worked from 1974 to 1975. Later, he worked in the news department of radio station KODA.

From 1977 to 1985, he cohosted the "Gospel Melody Hour" show on Houston's channel 39 (KHTV-TV). In 1975, he joined KCOH, a soul music station. He began hosting his current show 6 years ago. Mr. Harris, now the news director at radio station KCOH, hosts a gospel show from 6 to 8 a.m. weekdays, and his talk show from 8 to 11 a.m.

Mr. Harris' hard work and communications skills have carried him to the top of his profession. He has distinguished himself as an enduring figure in a competitive industry.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Harris on his victory in the "Top Jock" contest, to commend the SHAPE Community Center of Houston for its worthwhile efforts to assist Houstonians in obtaining educational and vocational skills, and to thank the Houston Chronicle for sponsoring this charitable contest.

□ 1420

SELECTION AS ADDITIONAL OBSERVER TO STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TALKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement with the Republican leadership and with the joint leadership of the Senate, I have selected, as an additional observer to the strategic arms reduction talks, Mr. CARR of Michigan.

FOREIGN AGENTS COMPULSORY ETHICS IN TRADE ACT [FACE IT]

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker we have all had days when we've wondered why we even bothered to get out of bed, and I'm sure that for former White House Deputy Chief of Staff Michael Deaver, today is one of those days.

In the last year, Federal investigations have been underway to determine if the lobbying activities in which Mr. Deaver engaged shortly after leaving Government service violated conflict-of-interest laws. It has been widely reported that Mr. Deaver could face an indictment this afternoon.

However, none of the charges that may be brought against Mr. Deaver relate to that aspect of his activities which I, many of my colleagues, and Americans from all walks of life find most objectionable: The fact that Mr. Deaver was using his clout in Congress and his influence in the White House to further the interests of foreign governments and foreign businesses in American policy considerations.

While the current ethics in Government law was sufficient to ensnarl Mr. Deaver, it simply offers no protection from the manipulative advantage gained by foreign interests when they hire former high-ranking Federal officials as their lobbyists and representatives.

Today I am being joined by my good friend and colleague, MARCY KAPTUR, in reintroducing the Foreign Agents Compulsory Ethics in Trade Act [FACE IT]—legislation that will slam the door between high-level Government service and foreign interest lobbying.

From our perspective, there is something fundamentally wrong when men and women who have had the privilege to serve at the highest levels of Government move to K Street and begin marketing their services—the influence, the access and the knowledge they gained at taxpayer expense—as powerful lobbying tools for America's stiffest industrial competition. It's not only that foreign interests gain a manipulative advantage by hiring former Government officials, what's also at stake is the integrity of the very institutions we expect to protect America's economic interests in the global marketplace. How, for example, can we be confident that our trade representative is negotiating aggressively on behalf of America's interest when he may have his eye on future employment with his counterparts on the other side of the table?

FACE IT denies foreign interests the manipulative advantage in U.S. trade policy considerations they now enjoy while simultaneously ensuring the integrity of our representation in trade negotiations with other nations. The bill prohibits any high-level Federal Government official—including the President, the Vice President, and Members of Congress—from representing or advising a foreign government or corporation in connection with any transaction involving the U.S. Government for 4 years after leaving Government service. Violators of the act would be subject to a fine of \$250,000, or the amount of compensation received for the prohibited act, whichever is greater.

Mr. Speaker, last year we were successful in moving from virtual obscurity through subcommittee markup. This year, we are hopeful that with the support and advocacy of our colleagues, the important safeguard contained in FACE IT will become law. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this necessary measure.

DON'T WASTE MY STATIONERY

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, an impecunious relative once borrowed \$50 from Benjamin Franklin, and then asked his benefactor for a sheet of paper so that he could write an IOU for the amount. "What!" exclaimed Franklin, "you want to waste my stationery as well as my money?"

Unfortunately, the American banks could not treat their loans to Brazil with the same nonchalance, as a large part of their capital is at stake:

Citicorp, \$4.6 billion, 34 percent of capital.
Chase, \$2.8 billion, 42 percent of capital.
BankAmerica, \$2.7 billion, 37 percent of capital.
Manufacturers, \$2.3 billion, 41 percent of capital.

Brazil is the world's largest debtor. Her unilateral suspension of interest payments on \$67 billion worth of debt would put these loans in the "nonperforming" category. After 90 days the loan-loss provisions of bank regulations would be triggered throwing the banking system into chaos.

The 50 percent depreciation of the dollar in the past 2 years apparently did nothing to ease the burden of world debt. America owes \$700 billion and is owed \$600 billion. The rub is that while her debtors are third-world countries with soft currencies such as Brazil and the Philippines, her creditors are the hard currency countries: Germany and Japan.

For more than 15 years now we have lived in a world of burgeoning paper money in which all currencies, instead of being payable in gold at a fixed rate

as most were before 1971, have not been payable in anything at all. A system of IOU-nothing paper currencies cannot work. It produces an unrestrained explosion of debt. At some point the creditors balk at accepting ever more debt, so more and more debtors default, bringing down the house of cards.

We are fast approaching that point.

THE IRANIAN ARMS DEAL

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have not said much about the Iranian scandal because I think it is embarrassing enough for everyone concerned. But last night's statement by the President, "Do you remember what you were doing on August 8," the President asked, that really strains our imagination. I will tell you one thing, if I were approving arms to the Ayatollah Khomeini, I would remember what I was doing on that date.

But this is not an issue of memory. This is an issue of judgment. Apparently we had some folks in the White House who decided, as a matter of conscious decision, that they wanted to send American arms to the Ayatollah Khomeini. That was an incredible mistake in judgment.

If you went to any small town cafe in this country and you asked a bunch of folks at that cafe what is the goofiest thing that this country could do with a bunch of arms if we wanted to ship them around the world, I bet you that those folks in that cafe would say that the goofiest thing that we could do is to send them to the Ayatollah, and yet, that is exactly what the folks down at the White House have done. Now this President says, "Well, I don't remember. I forget." I would want to forget too if I had decided we wanted to send guns to the Ayatollah Khomeini.

But this is a more serious issue than that. We need to resolve our foreign policy and get back on a constructive course. We need a new team, in my judgment.

LET'S HELP SENIORS NOW BY PASSING HEALTH BILL

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] in urging our colleagues to support the legislation we have introduced today to provide catastrophic health care protection for our senior citizens and to begin the process of determining how we can also deal with

the problems of long-term care and catastrophic coverage for those under 65.

This legislation, which I call "Peace of Mind Protection," is notable for the many advances it pioneers for our senior citizens who worry most about a catastrophic illness and the financial ruin that often accompanies those tragedies. With passage of this historic bill, we can help allay both those fears.

But let me briefly mention several things our legislation will not do:

It will not require an expansion of the Federal bureaucracy.

It will not increase taxes on the working age population.

It will not add to the budget deficit.

It will not undermine State regulation of the insurance industry.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing this peace of mind protection to our senior citizens and to join us in exploring ways to provide long-term care and catastrophic health care coverage to the general population.

CONGRESSMAN TONY P. HALL SPEAKS ON BILL TO SUSPEND MOST-FAVORED-NATION TRADE STATUS FOR ROMANIA

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to introduce today a bill to temporarily suspend most-favored-nation trade status to Romania for 6 months.

In July 1985, the three of us traveled to Romania. We observed firsthand the persecution of religion and other human rights abuses. Despite token efforts by the Romanian Government to court world opinion, reports continue to reach us of harassment and repression of the evangelical Christian churches.

A number of Christians currently are in prison because of their steadfast loyalty to their religious beliefs. The Romanian authorities have also continued to demolish churches and have denied building permits to allow new churches to be constructed. The Government has also attempted to manipulate the churches through its control of the licensing of pastors. The Government of Romania further limits the availability of Bibles and Christian literature to believers. By denying official recognition to certain congregations, the Romanian Government makes these churches "illegal" and subject to fines and other harassment.

The list could go on and on of various large and petty ways that the Romanian Government seeks to suppress the evangelical churches. Some Chris-

tian prisoners of conscience have been released from prison, and some have been allowed to emigrate. Yet these gestures cannot hide the pattern of religious repression in Romania.

That government has never shown any shame over its persecution of the church. It will not be moved by expressions of concern or bad publicity. A 6-month suspension of MFN is the only way to get the attention of the Romanian Government and to convince it that it is in its own best interest to permit true freedom of religion.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with us in cosponsoring this legislation.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be an original sponsor of President Reagan's Catastrophic Health Insurance Program. This vital legislation is being introduced today with a large list of cosponsors.

The problem of catastrophic illness and its devastating effects on many of our senior citizens is very real. We must deal with this issue in a nonpartisan and expeditious manner. I pledge that as a member of the Health and the Environment Subcommittee which shares responsibility for this legislation I will work as hard as I can on this matter.

Our senior citizens need a method to protect themselves from the disaster of catastrophic illness. I have already spent a good deal of time on this issue and I have concluded that the plan drawn up by Secretary Bowen and submitted by President Reagan is the best way to help those who need it.

□ 1430

SUPPORT A CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I initially planned to speak about a bill I was introducing today with relation to the Federal Communications Commission. I think that what is more important is addressing the catastrophic health plan.

It was almost 10 years ago, under the Carter administration, that Secretary Califano had devised a plan, a plan that was a little better than catastrophic. We had two schools of thought: The catastrophic versus the Kennedy-Coleman bill, which was cradle-to-the-grave. There were bodies of support for each one of those, and they remain intractable.

As a result of that intractability, that Congress went out of session without any legislation at all. Had we at least the catastrophic at that point, we could have enhanced it. We could have enjoyed the benefit of experience.

What I exhort my colleagues today to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at this legislation; yes, try to improve it as much as you can, but do not jeopardize it. Cradle-to-the-grave is not reality at this point. Social Security of today would not have been passed in 1935.

Let us get our foot in the door, benefit from the experience, enhance it as we progress. Let us not deprive the people of this Nation of the benefit that will ultimately develop as a result of having a catastrophic insurance plan.

MUSTERING THE COURAGE TO GIVE THE COUNTRY A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, news reports indicate that the Democratic chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees are running up the white flag of surrender to a bigger Federal deficit in fiscal year 1988 before the first deficit reduction gun is ever fired. The Budget Committees haven't yet gone into markup sessions to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit targets of \$108 billion for fiscal year 1988 and a balanced budget by 1991, but the word goes out that they can't be met.

The last Congress passed a phased-in plan to balance the Federal budget by 1991 and the American people said "great," let's do it. For this Congress to abandon the plan now without an all-out effort to comply with it would be breaking faith with the American people. We cannot do this.

Congress must do what is right and best for the country and not seek an easy way out by saying we made a mistake—the original goals are unattainable. Every thinking individual knew those targets were going to be hard to attain and that we were going to have to tighten our belts to do so. If we set a precedent this year of ignoring the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target for fiscal year 1988, they will be meaningless in 1989 and beyond.

Without the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings guidelines to follow this 100th Congress will go down in history as just another big spending Congress and not the great Congress we want it to be.

I call on my Democrat colleagues—who control both Houses of this Congress—to make this a memorable Congress which had the courage to stay the course and make the tough deci-

sions to give the country a balanced budget.

FACE IT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, If America is to have any strength at all in trade negotiations, we must be certain that our negotiators truly have the best interests of the United States in mind. Today, Congressman HOWARD WOLPE and I are reintroducing the Foreign Agents Compulsory Ethics in Trade Act [FACE IT]. Our bill will put an end to the practice of former high-level Government officials selling out to foreign interests immediately after leaving Government service.

Last year, more than 120 Members joined us in our effort to block what has been called the service road to the gravy train. Our bill ensures the integrity and effectiveness of our national institutions by prohibiting any top-level U.S. official from representing or advising a foreign principal before our Government for 4 years after leaving Government service. This includes the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress.

Passage of FACE IT means America's taxpayers won't have to worry about being sold out by trade negotiators interested only in lining up fat contracts for themselves after they leave Government service. The only thing that should be on the minds of our top trade officials is representing America.

PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAMS—LET'S NOT REPEAT THE FHA FIASCO OF 1986

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congressman LES AU COIN and I introduced H.R. 1228, a bill which would provide the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with permanent authority to insure mortgages on single-family and multifamily dwelling units under the Federal Housing Administration.

This bill, which would make permanent the insuring authority, is intended to guarantee the continued availability of FHA mortgage insurance and, therefore, to maintain and enhance FHA's capacity to achieve the national housing goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

Mr. Speaker, the on-again, off-again situation with regard to the expiration of the FHA insuring authority experi-

enced during the last Congress highlights the necessity for a permanent approach to the authorization of the FHA mortgage insurance programs. Since 1970, annual or more frequent expirations of insuring authority have resulted in 17 lapses of this authority, for an average duration of approximately 9 days. In fiscal year 1986 alone, the 99th Congress allowed the insuring authority to expire six times, with a total hiatus of 51 days. The most serious lapse of authority occurred in June of 1986 when FHA was out of business for 19 straight days during the peak of the mortgage financing season.

The net result of this policy was to victimize hundreds of thousands of innocent would-be homebuyers. Every day FHA was out of business an estimated 10,000 homebuyers were affected. Most of these were first-time homebuyers who rely on the FHA program. This was a cruel trick to play on them because they had waited patiently for interest rates to fall to a level they could afford and then they were denied the opportunity to use FHA—the only program for which they could qualify.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the affect on the principal homebuyer, there was the rippling effect that was set in motion when these programs were disrupted. Lenders, realtors, title insurance companies, movers, and innocent third parties were all caught up in the turmoil that existed because Congress did not provide the necessary stability required for mortgage financing.

The current policy of annual reauthorizations did not begin until 1969. For the 27 years between 1934 and 1961, FHA's general insuring authority was open-ended, with no time limits or expiration dates. In the Housing Act of 1961, section 217 of the National Housing Act was amended to limit this general insuring authority to a 4-year period. Another 4-year extension was provided in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Mr. Speaker, there is, therefore, ample precedent for multiyear reauthorizations for this insuring authority. Moreover, there are other HUD programs, such as the assisted housing programs under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, which operate without expiration dates.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis this bill prevents the FHA insuring authorities from being used as a "hostage" or a vehicle to further enactment of broader housing legislation. Omnibus housing legislation should stand on its own merit and not be dependent on the FHA program.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1228 would restore the permanence of the FHA programs, that FHA enjoyed during its first 27 years of existence. I am sure my colleagues would agree that pas-

sage of this bill would be a fitting 53d birthday tribute to the FHA program, and more importantly would send a message to prospective American homebuyers that "we do care."

SUSPEND MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR ROMANIA

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, a bill to suspend for 6 months most-favored-nation status to the Government of Romania. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The administration admitted earlier this year that our policy toward Romania must change. On January 4, the administration repealed the Generalized System of Preferences [GSP] for the Government of Romania which had allowed many Romanian goods to enter the United States duty-free. This is a step in the right direction; however, more must be done.

While we continue to grant MFN to Romania, the Government continues to restrict the right to free speech, free assembly and association, and the freedom to worship. The Government of Romania continues to torture, arbitrarily arrest, deny fair public trials, and interfere with the privacy of its citizens. Members of evangelical church groups are singled out by the Romanian Government for especially severe treatment.

The United States Helsinki Watch Committee, among others, has called the Romanian Government "One of the most egregious offenders of human rights in Eastern Europe."

The United States has granted MFN to Romania for 11 years in the hope that it would increase leverage to move the Romanians away from the Soviet Union and reduce the number of human rights violations. Our expectations have never been met. We must stop deceiving ourselves about the nature of the Romanian Government. MFN status should be reserved for those nations that share our belief in basic human rights.

Romania is a repressive regime and the granting of MFN status and other special trade considerations only legitimizes this repression. Romania's gross violation of human rights is an affront to our heritage and principles. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKART). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on the motion on which further pro-

ceedings were postponed on Tuesday, February 24, 1987.

LIMITING FEES OF GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION FOR GUARANTY OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1056.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1056.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF UNITED STATES SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD'S ADDRESSES ON THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: BICENTENNIAL EDITION

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) to authorize the printing of "United States Senator Robert C. Byrd's Addresses on the History of the United States Senate: Bicentennial Edition."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 18

Whereas the Study Group on the Commemoration of the United States Bicentennial in 1982 recommended as worthy of separate publication and wide distribution the collected addresses of the history and traditions of the United States Senate, which United States Senator Robert C. Byrd began on March 21, 1980: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate Document "United States Senator Robert C. Byrd's Addresses on the History of the United States Senate: Bicentennial Edition" to be published under the supervision of the Secretary of the Senate with the editorial assistance of the Senate Historical Office.

Sec. 2. Such document shall include illustrations, and shall be in such style, form, manner, and binding as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing after consultation with the Secretary of the Senate.

Sec. 3. In addition to the usual number of copies, there shall be printed with suitable

binding 5,000 additional copies, for use by the Secretary of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely authorizes the printing of a document that originated in the Senate entitled "United States Senator Robert C. Byrd's Addresses on the History of the United States Senate."

The Senate leadership has asked for immediate consideration of this resolution as a matter of accommodation.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE COMMISSION ON THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BICENTENARY

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 101) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 101

Whereas the House of Representatives was established under the Constitution in the year 1789;

Whereas in the year 1989 the House of Representatives will celebrate the bicentennial of its establishment under the Constitution;

Whereas the House of Representatives for the past two hundred years has reflected the will and strength of the people of the United States and has, in its historical development, adhered to our national heritage of individual liberty and the attainment of equal and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is appropriate and desirable to provide for the observation and commemoration of this anniversary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is established in the House of Representatives the Commission on the United States House of Representatives Bicentenary (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 2. FUNCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to oversee the planning and direction of the commemoration of the bicentennial of the House of Representatives through an appropriate program of publications, exhibits, symposia, and related activities. The objective of this commemoration is to inform and emphasize to the Nation the role of the House of Representatives through two hundred years of growth, challenge, and change. The Commission is directed to develop a program, in consultation with the Office for the Bicentennial of the

House of Representatives, that will draw upon the resources of current and former Members, scholars, and the general public.

(b) COORDINATION WITH SENATE BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to coordinate programs commemorating the bicentennial of the House of Representatives with commemorative programs and activities directed by the United States Senate Bicentennial Commission.

(c) COORDINATION WITH COMMISSION ON THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to coordinate programs commemorating the bicentennial of the House of Representatives with commemorative programs and activities directed by the Commission on the Bicentennial of the United States Constitution.

SEC. 3. COMPOSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members appointed by the Speaker (in consultation with the minority leader) as follows:

(1) Six Members of the House, of whom not more than 3 shall be members of the same political party; and

(2) Two former Members of the House, of whom not more than 1 shall be members of the same political party.

The majority leader and the minority leader shall be ex officio members of the Commission.

(b) DESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN.—The Speaker shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as Chairman of the Commission.

(c) VACANCY.—Any vacancy in the membership of the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "Member" means a Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.

(a) RULES OF ORGANIZATION.—The Commission may make such rules with respect to its procedure as it considers necessary.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

SEC. 5. POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out its functions, the Commission is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) ACQUISITIONS.—The Commission is authorized to acquire any work of art, historical object, document or material relating to historical matters, or exhibit for placement in the House wing of the Capitol or the House office buildings.

SEC. 6. STAFF.

The Commission shall be staffed by the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives and shall have full supervisory powers over such Office. The Commission may also draw upon the staff support of such other employees of the House or its support agencies as may be agreed to by mutual consent.

SEC. 7. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The expenses of the Commission shall be paid from money appropriated to the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8. PERIODIC REPORTS.

The Commission may submit periodic reports on its activities to the House. Any

such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the 100th Congress, unless otherwise provided by law or resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] for 1 hour.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Louisiana [Mrs. Boggs].

□ 1440

Mrs. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to reestablish the Commission on the U.S. House of Representatives Bicentenary during the 100th Congress. During the 99th Congress, the Commission on the Bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives developed plans for ceremonial events, films, exhibits, symposia, conferences, and publications, among them the first historically correct biographical directory of the U.S. Congresses, 1774 to 1989 and Guide to Research Collections of Former Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, 1789 to 1987, and a bicentennial brochure for visitors to the House of Representatives during this 100th Congress for the bicentennial year.

Those plans were presented to the House and printed in House Report 99-1008.

I believe we have made excellent progress in preparation for the bicentennial, but much work remains to be done to achieve our overall objectives by March 4, 1989, the 200th anniversary of the Congress, and also to continue more immediate plans for 1987 events in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the drafting of the U.S. Constitution. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a series of important bicentennial dates that extend all the way to 1991, the 200th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights.

The Commission on the Bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives expects to play a coordinating role in the House's salute to the Constitution in the special session of the Congress planned for Philadelphia on July 16, 1987. We want to be able to follow through with the work begun in the last Congress and to continue our cooperation and coordination of bicentennial plans with the Senate Bicentennial Commission and the Commission on the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution.

The Commission on the Bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives has been served well by the professional historical staff of the Office for the Bicentennial of the U.S. House of Representatives, headed by Dr. Raymond

Smock. I would urge Members to contact Dr. Smock on any matters related to the bicentennials of the U.S. Constitution and the Congress. His office is up to date on various bicentennial activities here in the Congress and around the country, and I know he would be glad to be of assistance to Members who have questions about the bicentennial or who may want to propose new bicentennial projects or events.

The upcoming events, Mr. Speaker, give us a rare opportunity to reflect on what 200 years of constitutional democracy has meant to this Nation. The U.S. Constitution is the greatest invention produced by this country, which is noted for its ingenuity and inventiveness. The framers of the Constitution invented a government where the people governed. They invented the unique combination of three co-equal branches of Government and they invented the idea of federalism, in which the States and the National Government share power. All these things are worthy of our deepest study and they are worthy of our best celebrations. It is the purpose of our great historic anniversaries to introduce to yet another generation of Americans and principles and values on which this Nation was built. We have much to celebrate, we have much to reflect upon, and we have a solemn obligation to the country to make certain that the memory of this Nation's history, including the history of Congress itself, is properly preserved and made available to the citizens of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission on the Bicentenary will well serve this body as an institution in preparing for its 200th anniversary and it will well serve its Members in assisting them to inform their constituents about the history and the role of "the people's House" in our democracy. I urge favorable action on this resolution.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I join the distinguished gentlewoman from Louisiana in her comments and would only add that she has represented the House of Representatives with great distinction on the Bicentennial Commission and in that this House owes her a debt of special gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 121 ADDRESSES THE SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH ISSUE

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, many of the more than 7 million workers born after 1916 who have filed for retirement benefits during the past 7 years have vigorously expressed concern about the Social Security notch issue.

While the General Accounting Office is currently conducting an examination of the problem, it is apparent that this positive action will not be completed for the next several months. I believe that individuals born in the notch years have waited long enough for reasoned congressional action, and I thus urge support of legislation—H.R. 121—I have developed to address the problem in a realistic manner.

H.R. 121 provides for a phase-in of the new benefit computation created by the 1977 Social Security Amendments that is uniform and follows congressional intent with respect to the 1977 law. Moreover, H.R. 121 allows for a uniform phase-in to new law in a responsible fashion relative to H.R. 1917, the most familiar notch bill. New Social Security Administration estimates put the cost of H.R. 1917 at \$193 billion over the years 1986-95, while H.R. 121 costs \$21.1 billion over 1988-95.

It is time to address the notch problem in a realistic manner, and support of H.R. 121 can go a long way in this regard. The bill will be reintroduced in the next several weeks with original cosponsors, and let me or my staff know if you would like to support the measure.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE OFFICIAL DEMOCRATIC OBJECTORS FOR THE 100TH CONGRESS

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker I take this time to announce the official objectors for the Democratic side for the 100th Congress.

For the Consent Calendar, our official representatives will be the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON].

For the Private Calendar, our official representatives will be the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD].

TENTH ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF FEDERAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 100-38)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKART) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and,

together with the accompanying papers, without objection referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has recently submitted to me a copy of the *Tenth Analysis and Evaluation of Federal Juvenile Delinquency Programs* as required by Section 204(b)(5) of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415), as amended. This letter fulfills the statutory requirement to respond to the Congress concerning this document and its recommendations.

This year's report and its recommendations focus on encouraging public-private partnerships. The objective is to target the specific needs of each community while encouraging fewer layers of bureaucracy and decreasing the dependency on Federal dollars.

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program has been effective, channeling almost one billion dollars since 1975 into various programs authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

Over the years, with the aid of these resources, the States have been able to accomplish the primary goals of deinstitutionalization of status offenders and the separation of juvenile and adult offenders at the State and local levels. In addition, many successful demonstration programs have been implemented in jurisdictions across the country. We, therefore, think that it is time to turn over the responsibility for continuing these programs to the State and local communities who benefit from them.

Several of the OJJDP's recommendations will go a long way toward making the transition from total reliance on Federal funds. Interagency cooperation and efforts to provide coordinated juvenile justice activities will ensure the most efficient use of taxpayer dollars. This is key because although we are proposing termination of OJJDP, there are still other Federal agencies that will be providing services and programs benefiting juveniles. Also, the Administrator recommends encouraging the involvement of States, community groups, volunteers, public-private partnerships, and the private sector in protecting society and reducing juvenile crime.

However, simply because we propose terminating this Federal grant program it would be a mistake to conclude that the Administration's commitment to a strong criminal justice system is less than complete. Rather, we have sought improvements to those elements of the criminal justice system where we believe the Federal government has a legitimate responsibility. Indeed, it is precisely because of our

strong commitment to improving the criminal justice system that we continually search for scarce Federal dollars. Accordingly, Federal funding for the administration of justice has greatly expanded during my Administration. While 1982 funding totaled \$4.7 billion, as measured in outlays, my 1988 budget provides \$9.2 billion. This is an increase of almost 100 percent.

The report sets forth six recommendations for improving Federal juvenile delinquency prevention policy. I can assure you that each of the recommendations will be implemented to the extent possible with respect to funds appropriated in fiscal year 1987.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1987.

SIXTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY SINCE LITHUANIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN], for deferring to me. I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], who has traditionally risen on this day each year to make a point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the anniversary of Lithuanian national independence.

Because of an illness, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] could not join us today, but has asked me to conduct this special order. I take real pride in this opportunity, inasmuch as I am a first-generation Lithuanian American. My mother was born in Lithuania, and several years ago, I had an opportunity to visit that country and see firsthand what Lithuania means to the world today.

February 16, 1987, marks the 69th anniversary since Lithuanian national independence in 1918. Yesterday, the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 129, with its principal sponsor, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Russo].

In that resolution, we designated February 16, 1987, as Lithuanian Independence Day. There were more than 233 cosponsors of that resolution, indicating the solidarity of the United States House of Representatives and the American people with the struggle in Lithuania for independence.

There are more than 1 million Lithuanian Americans living in our country today. It is our duty to keep alive that spirit which is so important for the future of Lithuania and for those of us who carry Lithuanian blood.

The Soviet Union has attempted to wipe out the culture, religion and heritage of the Lithuanian people, but the spirit and yearning for freedom and independence still lives on.

Earlier today, our Chaplain, Father Pakalinskis, made specific reference to the history of Lithuania, which is a rich history, going back many centuries. But unfortunately, Lithuanians throughout their history, have struggled for independence. They are clearly dedicated to the ideal that every nation possesses the right to choose its own destiny.

The United States people share the vitality and character of the Lithuanian people's struggle for independence. The United States has never recognized the Soviet Union's occupation of the former governments of the Baltic States; Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Aside from the struggle for national culture, the struggle goes on today for religious freedom in Lithuania and in other parts of the world. Earlier today, I had a conversation with our House Chaplain, Chaplain Ford. He made a comment which is worth sharing.

When it comes to religion, those who seek to persecute others who want to express their own religious belief find that the harder you hit the nail, the deeper you drive it in the wood.

If a person had an opportunity, as I have had, to visit Lithuania, and to see firsthand the struggle to keep religion alive, you would realize that the efforts of oppression by the Soviet Union are backfiring. In fact, the people of Lithuania are dedicated now more than ever to preserve their identity and their freedom.

So whether it is the Catholic Church in Nicaragua, the B'hai religion in Iran, the Jewish and Baptist believers in the Soviet Union or the Catholic Church in Lithuania, the United States must stand foresquare for the expression of religious belief and the freedom of belief.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, today we are commemorating the 69th anniversary of the Lithuanian people's Declaration of Independence and freedom from foreign oppression on February 16, 1918. We should also recognize that Lithuania is observing the 736th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian Republic. We undertake this commemoration today with the strong hope that they will soon receive the freedom they richly deserve and have so long awaited.

The Lithuanian people had their freedom once—for a brief 22-year period before it was again taken forcefully from them by invading Soviet troops in 1940. During those brutal war years, over 30,000 Lithuanians were deported from their beloved homeland to stark labor camps in Siberia. The scars and memories of those times keep the spirit of freedom alive and burning within the hearts of

Lithuanians today, despite their continued dominance by the Soviet Government.

As Americans who have long had our freedom, we must never overlook the problems which occur every day in less fortunate lands. We, in this country, must remember that freedom is indeed a birthright that cannot and should not be taken for granted nor taken away.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman DURBIN, and Congressman ANNUNZIO, who unfortunately could not be with us today, for sponsoring this special order today. The Lithuanian dream of freedom must be sustained. With our continued assistance and support, perhaps one day their dream can be realized.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in honoring the dedication to self-determination shown by the men and women of Lithuania. Since the 13th century the Lithuanians have chosen to be an independent state. We must never lose sight of the daily tragedy of the forceful occupation of these courageous people under the military domination of the Soviet Union.

I find the expropriation of all houses of worship by the Soviets one of the most glaring symbols of the hostile domination of a freedom loving people by those who have brutally attempted to destroy all traces of the culture and dreams of the Baltic States. I continue to protest the drafting of men in occupied Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviets for their aggression in Afghanistan. International law continues to be violated daily; to say the list of moral violations would boggle one's mind.

We must stand together in denouncing this blatant tyranny and continue to press our State Department to do all that is possible to encourage these oppressed people in their quest for freedom.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. This is a day that must be remembered by free men everywhere.

The courageous Lithuanian people declared their independence from Czarist Russia in 1918. After a brief 22 years, however, that country's freedom was crushed by invading Soviet troops.

I am proud that our Government never recognized Soviet domination over that country. The loss of any nation to the Soviet empire is a tragedy for the free world. Only by remembering these events can we profit from the mistakes of the past. We must never forget when freedom was lost in a distant land.

In spite of overwhelming oppression, the Lithuanian people are still struggling to maintain their identity and regain their independence.

We must continue to mark this occasion and honor the spirit of a free Lithuania. We must continue to work for the day when Lithuanians can once again join the family of free nations.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute or two and add a few thoughts

this celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Celebrating the independence day of a people that remain in captivity brings mixed emotions. While we remember the tradition of freedom that the Lithuanian people have maintained for centuries, we recall the courage and perseverance these people have demonstrated over the years. We also realize that the freedom we celebrate today is denied to Lithuanians in their homeland.

Dominated by the Russians for over a century, the Lithuanian people demonstrated their resolve to be independent by revolting against Czarist oppression on three occasions. Since the Soviets occupied Lithuania in 1917, the Lithuanian people have steadfastly resisted the occupation of their homeland. Lithuanians were on the forefront of the human rights movement in Soviet occupied territory. The struggle for Lithuanian independence has not been dulled by oppression, and we celebrate today their commitment to liberty.

Yet this celebration of the tenacity of a freedom loving people has a sober side. Today we should also remember those that do not enjoy the liberty we often take for granted. Freedom, the object and celebration of this day, is not shared by everyone. There are Lithuanians who today are in prison for the defense of basic human rights. Let us reflect for a moment on the conditions under which the Lithuanians who remain in their homeland live, and let us remain steadfast in our commitment to commemorating the struggle of all the peoples who live in captive nations.

We will continue to recognize the efforts of the Lithuanian people to keep the idea of liberty alive in their hearts, even as those who remain in Lithuania are prohibited from realizing the blessings of liberty in their daily lives.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed honored to join my colleague RICHARD DURBIN for today's special order commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

This day marks the 69-year anniversary of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence. On February 16, 1918 the Lithuanian people proclaimed their right to live among the community of free nations. The Lithuanian people, devastated by World War I, soon began rebuilding their nation and establishing safeguards to protect their newly won freedom. However, this small Baltic nation and her neighboring states of Latvia and Estonia were soon overrun by the brutal force of Stalin's Red Army.

Since that day the Lithuanian people have been prisoners in their own homeland. They are subject to continuing attacks on religious and individual freedoms as the Soviets attempt to wipe out the culture, heritage, and religion of the Lithuanian people.

However, the Lithuanians have persisted in their quest to break the iron bonds of Soviet oppression and regain their liberty and freely practice their unique and wonderful culture once again.

As we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our own Constitution and the freedoms it upholds let us not forget the valiant struggle of those men and women in Lithuania who are battling for the liberation of their beloved homeland. There can be no doubt that this Congress and the people we represent sup-

port the return of independence to Lithuania and unreservedly condemn the continuing occupation by the Soviets. We will not rest in our efforts until Lithuania and her neighboring states are permitted to regain their rightful place in the community of free nations.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Illinois for arranging this special order, and to thank our colleagues for joining us in commemorating this very special day.

February 16, 1987, marked the 69th anniversary of the birth of the free and independent Lithuanian Republic, an event which should be one of unrestrained celebration. But instead it is one that is at best only bitter-sweet, because Lithuanian independence lasted for only 22 short years before it was brutally crushed by the Soviet Union in 1940. The few short years from 1918 to 1940 represents the only time in hundreds of years that the Lithuanian people have been free of the rule of foreigners, notably the Germans, the Poles, and the Russians. In those 22 years, however, the flame of human achievement burned brightly, and provided a marked contrast to the subsequent years of Soviet domination.

During the years of Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian society was transformed into a vibrant, democratic nation-state, and it experienced a cultural renaissance in Lithuanian arts and music. The Government instituted land reform, created many public works, and developed an excellent education system. Business and industry flourished. For the first time in over a 100 years, Lithuania was free of Russian rule.

But in 1940, the Soviet Union coerced the Lithuanians into allowing the stationing of Soviet troops and aircraft in their country, and soon after that staged a mock election and incorporated Lithuania, as well as its sister republics of Latvia and Estonia, into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the effects of Soviet rule were immediate: Thousands of Lithuanians were deported, and exiled to Siberia; thousands more fled; the Soviets resumed a Russification Program begun by the Czars which attempted to brutally crush all vestiges of Lithuanian culture and national feeling. With the exception of the handful of months in which the Soviets lost possession of Lithuania to Nazi Germany, the Soviets have maintained their campaign of deportation, oppression, and colonization.

The United States has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and rightly so. Every year on this date, Americans pause to remember Lithuania's 20 golden years of freedom, and to express our fervent hope that soon Lithuania will once again be a free country. The tremendous personal tragedies suffered by the Lithuanian people would of themselves justify our commemoration of this day. The countless repressive acts and the tyrannical nature of the Soviet Union, also justifies our actions this day. However, there is an even greater message we commemorate today, and that message is that every people has an inherent right to self-determination.

The Soviet Union has a long and bloody history of disregard for the basic human rights of its own citizens as well as those of the

Baltic States and its Eastern European satellites. But the Soviets are not alone in denying individuals the right to govern themselves. All over the world there are brutal dictatorships which call themselves democracies, and today we should also take time to remember their unwilling citizens.

I feel honored to have the opportunity to speak on the Lithuanian people's behalf in recognition of their courage and resolve. They are a source of inspiration, and a reminder of the indomitability of the human spirit which struggles for liberty and justice even under the oppressive yoke of an unyielding totalitarian regime. I am very pleased to announce that on February 24, 1987, the House of Representatives passed House Joint Resolution 129, legislation designating February 16, 1988, as the 70th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian freedom. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues for their support once again. I am thrilled that the House of Representatives joined together to assure the brave people of Lithuania that they are not forgotten, and that all America shares their cherished hope of an independent Lithuania.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the people of Lithuania and Lithuanian-Americans celebrated the 69th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. On February 16, 1918, the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence was agreed to. But in remembering this historic occasion, we remember, too, the reality of today. Lithuania and its two Baltic neighbors to the North are still dominated politically and economically by the Soviet Union.

The Baltic States have seen their share of bloodshed. After being founded in 1918 by the Council of Lithuania, the Soviet Bolsheviks invaded, but the Soviets were finally and gloriously defeated after 2 hard years of battle. For two memorable decades, from 1920 to 1940, Lithuania was a sovereign nation, free to exercise basic political rights such as freedom of speech and expression, and freedom to choose one's leaders.

Sadly, the Baltic States were swallowed by Soviet hegemony in the region early in the forties. They remain shackled as a Soviet republic, and efforts to russify the Lithuanians continue today as they have for more than four decades.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the occasion of knowing many Americans of Lithuanian descent. I have never met a group of people with such fierce ethnic pride or such love for freedom. These traits remain as strong today as ever. They are the reason that, regardless of what the Soviet Union calls Lithuania, it will never be considered a part of the Soviet Union. And it never should be.

Our allies in Europe, through the 21-nation member Council of Europe, last month unanimously adopted a resolution asking that the Soviet Union respect the right of self-determination and human rights in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. A copy of the council's resolution follows:

BALTIC RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY ON JANUARY 28, 1987, BY THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The Assembly,

1. Considering that Article 1 of both the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights proclaims the right of peoples to self-determination, and that the Soviet Union is a Contracting Party thereto;

2. Considering that Principle VIII of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe guarantees the right of peoples to self-determination and also their right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status;

3. Recalling that the incorporation of the three Baltic states into the Soviet Union was and still is a flagrant violation of the right to self-determination of peoples, and that it remains unrecognized by the great majority of European states and many members of the international community;

4. Considering that the elimination of the international problems created by this incorporation demands solution on the basis of the international obligations entered into by the Soviet Union and other members of the international community;

5. Having noted and deplored serious violation of human rights, including freedom of religion, committed by the Soviet authorities in the three Baltic states;

6. Deplored the fact that, as result of forced immigration into their area, the Baltic peoples are brought under pressure to assimilate, and that the lack of possibilities for education and cultural expression of their own is leading towards the loss of national identity;

7. Recalling the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 13 January 1983, concerning the situation in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania;

8. Believing that, politically, a solution of the Baltic problem can best be sought in the wider framework of East-West relations, in particular relations between the two superpowers;

9. Considering that an improvement of those relations could make it more feasible effectively to raise the question of these countries' fate notably in the framework of the CSCE, the aim of which, by means of the endeavours of all European states, is to overcome East-West antagonism while respecting the right of each freely to determine its political, economic, social and cultural systems in accordance with the wishes of its population;

10. Noting that some of the principles governing mutual relations between the states participating in the CSCE take note of the territorial demarcation inherited at the end of hostilities in 1945 (inviolability of frontiers, territorial integrity) without, however, freezing the situation or sanctioning the European status quo;

11. **Emphasizing that the Helsinki Final Act** expressly provides for the possibility of changing frontiers, in accordance with international law, by peaceful means and by agreement;

12. **Emphasizing that, in the field of human rights, the states participating in the CSCE cannot invoke the principles of national sovereignty in order to prevent discussion of respect for these rights;**

13. Appeals to the Government of the Soviet Union to respect the right to self-determination and the human rights in the Baltic states;

14. Invites the governments of member states of the Council of Europe at the CSCE conference in Vienna and, if need be, at further CSCE meetings to draw the attention

of participating states to the serious violations of human rights and the right of self-determination in the three Baltic states.

I want to thank my good friend FRANK ANNUNZIO for setting this time aside to remember this historic day. I hope it remains a strong symbol of hope and commitment that the dream of freedom for the Baltic States will not perish.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating this day as the 69th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence, which took place on February 16, 1918.

The Lithuanian nation has existed for more than 3,000 years, and today is a shining light of the indomitable will of human spirit against the darkness of tyranny.

Lithuania historically practiced a peaceful disposition toward its neighbors. Additionally, many centuries of cultural development and prosperity, and great contributions in the arts, architecture, commerce and education established Lithuania as one of the unique cultures and great nations of Europe.

Lithuania fell victim in 1795 to the aggressive expansion of Czarist Russia. Despite years of ensuing repression and russification, the nation survived on the strength and will of its people. In 1918, at the close of the First World War, Lithuania proclaimed its independence and the reestablishment of the Lithuanian State as a republic.

During the years of independence, Lithuanian cultural life, the educational system and commercial undertakings grew at a rapid pace. Once again Lithuania was a respected member of the international community. She was a member of the League of Nations.

However, on the eve of the Second World War, a secret agreement was signed between Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia which gave the Soviets a free hand to invade and occupy Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia.

The world knows well the atrocities committed by the Soviets in their quest to subjugate the people of Lithuania. Stalinist policies of forced collectivization and national terror resulted in the deportation of more 300,000 to the wastelands of Siberia. The entire infrastructure of Lithuania and the other Baltic States was devastated and private property confiscated. No one was spared.

Yet through all this cruel injustice, the nation of Lithuania continues to thrive, in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians everywhere. It cannot and will not be crushed. The church, although officially outlawed, continues to represent the interests of Lithuanians. An underground church network and seminary have been established. Lithuania also produces more underground publications than any other country in the Eastern bloc.

The United States, and the other major Western powers such as Canada, Great Britain, and France, have consistently refused to recognize the legality of Soviet occupation. The diplomatic missions of the independent Republic of Lithuania continue to function in the free world and the treaties and agreements entered into by the Republic of Lithuania continue to have legal standing in the international community.

Today I join in spirit all Lithuanians, here in the United States and in Lithuania, in your long and noble struggle for independence and freedom.

I and my colleagues in Congress continue to protest the violation of human rights in Lithuania. Lithuania is subject to the same centralized rule, the same restrictions on civil and political liberties, and the same police controls as the republics in the Soviet Union. Moreover, Soviet policy toward the Lithuanian nation arouses grave concern because the process of russification continues, threatening Lithuania's survival as a distinct ethnic group.

We call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all nonnative troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania. We also call upon the Soviet Union to return all Lithuanian exiles from Siberian prison and labor camps, and to allow free elections under United Nations auspices.

Through continued recognition of the sovereignty of the Lithuanian state, through protest of the human rights violations and sovietization of Lithuania, and most importantly through the courageous efforts of Lithuanians in Lithuania and those here, led by the Lithuanian American Council, we promote and support the inalienable right to national independence and individual freedom for all Lithuanian people. Thank you very much.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with many of my colleagues to commemorate the 69th anniversary of the restoration of the independent State of Lithuania on February 16, 1918, and the 736th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian State in 1251.

With the advent of World War II, Lithuania found itself forcefully incorporated into the Soviet Union. Since that time, the Soviets have systematically sought to strip Lithuania of her heritage. Despite the often brutal oppression endured behind the Iron Curtain, the Lithuanian people continue today in their tenacious struggle for independence.

While the United States has refused to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and continues to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of independent Lithuania, over 500,000 Lithuanian-Americans and 3½ million Lithuanians living in Lithuania continue in their struggle for a restoration of true freedom and the preservation of their rich heritage.

It has been 47 years since the Lithuanians were stripped of their independence. I urge all Americans to remember the plight of the Lithuanian people and to join in celebrating a day of freedom that we hope to see again.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes amid the many demands on our time to address that event: the 69th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania. The plight of Lithuania as a victim of Soviet aggression and occupation is all too easily forgotten as we struggle with later and even ongoing Soviet efforts to add to their empire by conquest. Looking at the flow of Soviet weapons via Cuba through Nicaragua into El Salvador, and reading of repeated Soviet atrocities in Afghanistan, we sometimes tend to forget momentarily the continuing ultimate atrocity of an entire nation

subdued and burdened with the yoke of Soviet domination.

Because we can never permit our selves to forget the miserable circumstances of those millions of Lithuanians who to this day live under alien rule, I am pleased to join my colleagues by adding to the RECORD this statement of my concern. The valorous Lithuanian people have been tenacious in retaining their national identity. They are an example to all of us for their patriotism and personal loyalty. If these Lithuanian patriots are able to carry forward their national identity despite Soviet attempts at cultural, genocide, then the United States can at least honor their resistance by continuing to refuse official recognition of Lithuania and its Baltic neighbors as parts of the U.S.S.R.

Like so many small countries of Eastern and Central Europe, Lithuania has had to resist the forces of totalitarianism from the Communists of the Soviet Union after suffering for years under the Nazis of Hitlerite Germany. And, like so many of these countries, Lithuania faced the dreadful disappointment of losing a set of Nazi chains only to gain another set of Communist fetters when Hitler's war machine collapsed in 1944-45, and the Soviet bear embraced the Baltic States.

Lithuania and its neighbors never even enjoyed the brief respite from oppression in 1946-47 that others experienced. The cold war came early in the Baltic, and it has never left.

Let me say that the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Helsinki accords, were never intended to consign the people of Lithuania and its neighbors to the dustheap of forgotten peoples. The Soviets may argue for their twisted interpretation to which misinterpretation we can only reply by hammering on this theme: Lithuania, along with its Baltic neighbors, is and ought to be independent. And we must also point out constantly to the Soviets that national rights of language, worship, and political preference are also part of the Helsinki accords. In short, the least we in free America can do is to remind the Soviet Union at every occasion that they are breaking not only their own constitution but international commitments. We have a stake in this struggle because when freedom is diminished anywhere it is diminished everywhere.

I salute the people of Lithuania on the 69th anniversary of their independence. Long may we celebrate the occasion, and, God willing, one day soon, may we celebrate it with them in their own capital of Vilna.

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanians of Greater Los Angeles area, assembled this 16th day of February, 1987 at Lithuanian St. Casimir Parish Hall in Los Angeles to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1987 marks the 69th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian State;

That Lithuania was recognized as a free and independent nation by the entire free world. Lithuania was a member of the League of Nations. However, Lithuania was by force and fraud occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union.

That the Soviet Union is the last remaining colonial empire that relentlessly is subjugating independent countries; Lithuania being one of the Soviet Union's first victims.

That the Soviet invaders, even though using tortures and deportations, concentration camps and psychiatric wards are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-government and independence. That is highly evident from the numerous underground press and strong dissident activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we are grateful to President Reagan and the Department of State for statements that an official diplomatic non-recognition of the forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R. of the three Baltic nations will continue to be a position of this administration. Furthermore, we would like to express our gratitude for the declaration of the Baltic Freedom Day.

We urge the United States of America and other nations of the free world to use diplomatic and other possible pressures that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, secret police apparatus, foreign administration; and release from jails, concentration camps and psychiatric wards people who struggle for human rights and liberty; and restore self-government in Lithuania.

We ask the U.S. Congress to investigate the cooperation of the Office of Special Investigation with the Soviet institutions and the KGB. We remind that deportation to the Soviet Union of persons who lost their U.S. citizenship is inhuman because there, they would land in slave labor camps, or would be executed. Such deportation of Balts would be contrary to the non-recognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

We express our most sincere gratitude to the U.S. Congress for the impressive annual commemoration of Lithuania's independence.

We desire that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the U.S. Congressmen and Senators from our State and to the news media.

Antanas Maxeika, President, Lithuanian-American Council, Los Angeles; Mykolas Naujokaitis, President, Lithuanian National Foundation, Inc., Los Angeles; Angele Nelsas, President, Lithuanian Community, Los Angeles.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate today in this special order to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. Lithuania emerged as a state on the face of Europe in 1293. For over 500 years, Lithuania and its people developed a rich culture and tradition. By 1795, Lithuania found itself confronted by the growing power of Czarist Russia and, as a result, lost its independence.

Despite Russian occupation, the Lithuanian identity survived. In January 1863, an insurrection against Russian authority, although unsuccessful, spoke forcefully about the will of the Lithuanian people to reassert their independence.

The First World War saw control of Lithuania pass from Russia to Germany. By 1918, the void left by the collapse of Germany and Czarist Russia provided the Baltic States, among others, with the opportunity to regain their national self-determination. On February 16, 1918, the Council of Lithuania declared the nation independent. In its own way, Lithuania's assertion of national self-determination and its willingness to play a role in the interna-

tional system spoke to the attraction of the Wilsonian vision for the postwar world.

By August 1922, Lithuania had established a democratic republic. Although Lithuania faced considerable challenges in the interwar period, it continued to struggle to solidify both its independence and a democratic form of government. As a small state lodged between two hostile dictators, Lithuania by 1940, was in a tragically unfortunate position. In 1940, the Soviet Union annexed Lithuania. Nazi Germany seized the country in 1941 during its invasion of the Soviet Union. By 1944, as the tide of war turned, Moscow reincorporated the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, an unnecessary move that the United States has wisely chosen not to recognize.

In our century, the experience of Lithuania is a forceful reminder of the ruthlessness of totalitarian powers and the need for vigilance in the preservation and extension of liberty for all peoples. The Lithuanian people have repeatedly demonstrated their determined and patient struggle for independence. We, as a democratic people, must continue to work toward the day when Lithuania and all captive nations will enjoy freedom.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with many of my colleagues in commemorating the 69th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

After 500 years as a free and sovereign nation, Lithuania was occupied by Russia in 1795. They remained occupied, by the Russians and later by the Germans, until February 16, 1918, when the Lithuanian people declared their country a united and independent republic.

Sadly, Lithuania's independence lasted a mere 22 years. In 1940 the Soviet Union demanded the formation of a Soviet-controlled government as part of the Nazi-Soviet alliance, and held a one-party election. The Soviet Union annexed its tiny, heroic neighbor 1 month later. Occupied by Germany for most of World War II, it was reoccupied by the Soviet Union at the war's end.

The people of Lithuania have a long, rich cultural and religious heritage. Under Soviet occupation untold thousands of Lithuanians have been killed, imprisoned or deported for fighting to preserve their culture and their political independence. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been forced to flee their native land. Soviet oppression has cost Lithuanians their religious freedom. The Catholic Church, by far the dominant religion of the Lithuanian people, has been the target of particularly harsh treatment.

The United States has never recognized the unlawful occupation of Lithuania and her neighbors, and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the independent Republic of Lithuania.

Lithuanians treasure their heritage. It is their belief in traditional values and their desire to hold on to the past that have given Lithuanians their spirit and strength. We should honor all Lithuanians around the world on the anniversary of their independence, but we should remember their struggles every day. We must not rest until Lithuanians, and oppressed peoples everywhere, have succeeded in their quest for freedom.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 69th anniversary of the Lithuanian Independence Day. On February 16, 1918, a newly elected 20 member council declared an independent Lithuanian State based on democratic principles and freedoms.

After finally freeing itself from repressive Czarist Russia, the young state was faced with the military aggression of both Hitler's Germany and the Soviet Union. On June 15, 1940, the Soviets forced the Lithuanians to form a friendly government and occupied the country. As a result, many Lithuanians fled the country, while over 30,000 others were unjustly arrested and deported to Siberian concentration camps. When World War II finally ended, the Lithuanian people, who had suffered the brutality of both the Germans and the Soviets, remained under Soviet domination.

Despite their long history of religious, cultural, and political oppression, Lithuanians have not given up hope that one day the Baltic nations will be free to make their own choices. It is this hope that makes Lithuanian Independence Day a special event for all people who cherish freedom. Recently, this hope has evolved into a courageous dissident movement. As the freedom movement grows within the Baltic nations, freedom-loving people everywhere should continue to speak out and support the Lithuanians and their Baltic neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for Americans to remember that the United States has never recognized the annexation of the Baltic nations. It is my sincere hope that these people will some day experience the freedoms that Americans hold so dear.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day and commend the House on yesterday's swift adoption of House Joint Resolution 129 which directs the President to issue a proclamation designating February 16, 1988 as "Lithuanian Independence Day."

Sixty-nine years ago, on February 16, 1918, the courageous people of Lithuania asserted their right to self-determination after years of Russian and German rule and declared Lithuania a united and independent republic.

After 22 short years of freedom and independence, the Soviet Union annexed Lithuania and attempted to destroy the cultural identity of these proud people through an intensive russification campaign.

The United States has never recognized the unlawful occupation of Lithuania and her neighbors, and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representatives of the independent Republic of Lithuania.

Thousands of brave Lithuanians have been killed or imprisoned by the Soviet Union for their attempts to preserve their rich culture and heritage, and for their bitter struggle to restore the religious freedom and political independence their homeland once enjoyed. Thousands more have fled Soviet oppression and relocated throughout the free world. Today we stand with these proud and courageous individuals to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day, but more importantly, to

add support and encouragement to their cause.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues in recognizing the continuing struggle of Lithuania to regain the independence it achieved in February 1918. My mother's family came from Lithuania, as did my wife, Valerie's family, so recognition of Lithuanian Independence Day is especially meaningful to me.

It has now been almost 70 years since a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates proclaimed an independent Lithuanian State based on democratic principles. During its years of independence, Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations, adopted a permanent constitution granting freedom of speech, assembly, religion and communication, and instituted social reforms benefiting all citizens. Lithuania's attempts to maintain its independence and neutrality during World War II ended in 1940 when a rigged election requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

The struggle to regain lost freedoms and independence continues to the present day. Despite harassment by the Soviets, thousands of Lithuanians participate in protests by signing petitions, distributing dissident publications and holding anti-Soviet demonstrations. The Lithuanian people have proven again and again that the size and power of the Soviet Union will not deter them in their struggle to regain independence.

We, as Americans, must continue to protest the illegal incorporation, by force of arms, of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. I urge my colleagues to commend the continuing struggle of the Lithuanian people, and to call upon Secretary Gorbachev to restore Lithuania to its rightful place in the international community.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of pride and admiration that I join all Lithuanians in their recognition and celebration of the 69th anniversary of a truly independent nation of Lithuania, and of the 600th anniversary of Christianity in Lithuania.

It is with great admiration that we pay tribute to a time, not so long ago, when the struggle of the Lithuanian people to realize their most fervid hopes and dreams of a free and independent nation was gloriously realized. Despite being subjugated under the iron-fist of Soviet domination for more than a century, Lithuanians refused to allow this dream to fade; the tragedy is the terribly brief time which Lithuanians were able to flourish under an independent banner.

By recognizing the 69th anniversary of an independent Lithuania, we also challenge the Soviet Union to demonstrate fidelity to their recent promulgations of "glasnost"—or increased international openness—by granting Lithuanians, and all Baltic peoples the right to exercise self-determination, an action which is tragically and historically overdue.

Recently, the 21-nation member Council of Europe adopted a resolution calling on the Soviet Union to respect the right of self-determination and human rights for the people of the Baltic States; Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Let us join our European neighbors in urging the Soviet Union to accept this resolu-

tion for freedom, and to respect, at long last, the individual right of all Baltic people to shape their own destiny, unfettered by Soviet hegemony.

It is imperative that Lithuanians are reminded of our strong and incontrovertible support for their continued struggle to secure the individual liberty and sanctity for human rights which we in America enjoy without fear of reprisal. I commend my colleague, Representative MARTY RUSSO of Illinois for introducing House Joint Resolution 129, and fully support this legislation to commemorate February 16, 1988, as National Lithuanian Independence Day.

By recognizing the 600th year anniversary of Christian worship in Lithuania, we pay tribute both to the indomitable legacy of a universal religion, and the irrefutable spirit of a proud Lithuanian people determined to keep the embers of Christianity burning despite concerted Soviet efforts to extinguish this flame.

As Americans, we have a responsibility to continue to hold the beacon of hope aloft for those struggling for independence and freedom everywhere as a symbol of our deep commitment to their noble crusade. Let us always remain faithful to this great challenge.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join with my colleagues today in commemorating the 69th anniversary of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence, which took place on February 16, 1918. Over the past year, we have seen many human rights triumphs around the world but we cannot forget that the people of Lithuania who are denied the basic human right of self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania have a history of sovereignty that can be traced back to the 11th century, but for the past 69 years, the sovereignty of the Lithuanian people has been denied. On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania. After Soviet-controlled elections were held, Lithuania was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Throughout World War II, alternating occupation by Soviet and Nazi forces caused great suffering and the loss of countless innocent lives. 300,000 people were deported to Siberia under Stalin's regime.

Since 1940, the Lithuanian people have been subjected to a campaign of repression by the Kremlin. Today most Lithuanians are Roman Catholics who are denied their religious freedom. The Catholic Church of Lithuania has been the target of harassment. The Soviet leaders have closed churches and seminaries and continue to persecute those who attempt to remain active in the church and pass along its teachings to their children. Each of these actions is in violation of the Helsinki accords, which the Soviet Union signed. The members of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, established in 1976 to monitor Soviet compliance with the Helsinki accords, were effectively eliminated by the Soviet authorities.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has never recognized the Soviet state operating in Lithuania. Today we mark the plight of the Lithuanian people, but we must remember them every day and never relax our efforts until their freedom is restored. The Lithuanian

people and their families here in America have my support and my prayers that one day Lithuania will again be a free and sovereign nation.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day.

We Americans sometimes lose sight of the fact that our freedom, won and preserved at such a high cost, is a precious thing that is lost much more easily than it is gained. Lithuania lost its freedom, but there are many patriotic individuals both there and in the United States who hold on to the dream that, one day, the peoples of Lithuania may again know the feeling of true liberty and justice, and that autocracy may soon be replaced with autonomy in the great Baltic State.

I commend the efforts of those who continue to struggle against totalitarianism, and I reaffirm my commitment impressing upon Soviet leaders that its oppression of these peace-loving people is unacceptable to the Government of the United States and to all Americans.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. It is my hope that we will one day see the freedom of these people restored.

The Lithuanian people fought for and obtained their independence on February 16, 1918, and for 22 years a generation of Lithuanians proudly grew up with true peace and freedom. However, at the end of World War II Lithuania found itself incorporated into the Soviet Union. Now, 47 years after their independence was stripped, 3½ million Lithuanians living in Lithuania and over 500,000 Lithuanian-Americans have been seeking to preserve Lithuanian heritage and to restore Lithuanian freedom.

I support the Lithuanian efforts and condemn the Soviet Union for their current policy of human rights violations and encourage them to grant freedom to those who deserve it.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring the 69th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. As we all know, that country's attempts at creating a free and just society were brought to a sudden end just 22 years later by the naked aggression and illegal invasion by the Soviet Union in June 1940. Mass arrests and deportations to Siberia took place, involving a reported 350,000 citizens, or about one-tenth of the population. Repression and human rights violations continue to this day, but despite these actions and long-term attempts at a policy of russification, the proud people of Lithuania have resisted and are determined to maintain their cultural and religious traditions.

Since the last anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we have heard and read much to suggest that under General Secretary Gorbachev a policy of liberalization and greater openness was being pursued by the Soviet Government. The Soviets have been quick to point to their freeing of several notable Soviet Jewish dissidents and human rights activists as evidence of these new reforms. While not wishing to lessen the importance of these events, it is worth noting that other dissidents, with less notoriety, only secured release after

signing declarations to discontinue their activities to promote the observance of basic human rights. Further, an estimated 400,000 Soviet Jews, who have officially begun the emigration process, are still waiting to leave with no immediate hope of realizing their desire.

Mr. Speaker, it is far too early to cast judgment on the latest Soviet reforms. We can remain hopeful that these reforms will lead to true human rights improvements in the Soviet Union, but we have more reason than not to view their actions with skepticism; particularly in view of the dismally low number of Soviet Jews being allowed to emigrate, the violent attacks recently on western journalists and Soviet human rights advocates; and the long history of repression in Lithuania and other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased with yesterday's House passage of House Joint Resolution 129, designating February 16, 1988, as "Lithuanian Independence Day." I was proud to be a cosponsor of this important measure along with more than 230 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. Clearly, as leaders of the free world, we must send a strong message of support to the millions of freedom lovers in Lithuania and in other captive nations around the world. They will not be forgotten.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in recognition of Lithuanian Independence Day, a day commemorating the historic occasion when on February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian people reclaimed their freedom after 123 difficult years of Russian and German rule. The tireless efforts of the Lithuanian people secured a precious freedom that we here today have hope will be revisited in years to come.

Since 1940, when Lithuania was forcefully incorporated into the Soviet Union, the life and culture of this proud nation has been put through the severest of tests. The record documenting the repression of Lithuanian nationalists, the persecution of religious leaders, the denial of basic human and civil rights * * * in short, the entire legacy of the Soviet Russification campaign against the Lithuanian people and their culture, has been harsh and tragic.

As this year also marks the 10th anniversary of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, a group committed to assisting in the implementation of the Helsinki accords, it is worthwhile to ponder the current conditions within Lithuania through the spectacle of the new Soviet leader's (Mr. Gorbachev) glasnost or openness campaign. While we have heard that the Soviet society is changing and that political prisoners are being released, I concur with Mr. Gorbachev's statement made in Riga, Latvia, where he said, "We've got a lot to do."

Has glasnost reached Lithuania? According to informed sources, out of the 54 known prisoners who have been released as of yesterday, only 1 is Lithuanian. While I praise the release of Lithuanian Helsinki monitor Vytautas Skuodys, who was imprisoned for what we in the West would call peacefully expressing his views regarding proper human rights conditions, we remember the condition of others like Balys Gajauskas.

Mr. Gajauskas, age 60, now in his 35th year in Soviet labour camps, is one individual

whose prison doors have been closed to glasnost. A leader in the fight for a free Lithuania and noted as unofficial historian of the Lithuanian movement for independence, Mr. Gajauskas' only crime is his love of truth and country. After 25 years of prison for his noble activities, he, in 1973, again became actively involved with the Lithuanian nationalist movement, which by that time had found a new outlet in the samizdat or self-publishing method of disseminating information. In the ensuing years, as Mr. Gajauskas sought to preserve truth and provide his countrymen with accurate information, he was subjected to harassment and had much of his writing confiscated, including a special list of 135 Lithuanian political prisoners. In 1977, charged with anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda, Mr. Gajauskas was sentenced to 10 years in a special regime camp and 5 years internal exile. For the last 4 months, according to his relatives, no one has received any letters from him and there has been no news regarding his state of health following his 2 months in the hospital.

There is much wisdom in the statement of Jean Bernard Raimond, the former French Ambassador to Moscow, "On the one hand, we must be watchful for everything that is new and not assume that nothing is going to change in the Soviet Union. On the other hand, we must make sure that we do not succumb to illusions or make concessions costly to the interests of the West" (Time, March 2, 1987). Glasnost will be real when all of the people living under Soviet rule are accorded the rights agreed upon in the Helsinki document, a document signed freely by the Soviet Union.

I call on Moscow to succeed with glasnost and to embark on a bold new path toward real freedom. Openness is something necessary in a closed society. I urge the Soviets to free their entire society and grant the peoples they have oppressed for so many years the right to self-determination. No nation on Earth has territorial goals vis à vis the Russian people and they should feel free and safe to abandon theirs' and allow the nations which they hold captive the independence they so richly deserve. I look forward to the day when we will celebrate a new Lithuania, a Lithuania created by the vision of freedom and democracy embedded within the hearts of all Lithuanians.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 69th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, but do so with the firm understanding that Lithuania still lives under the shadow of Russian domination and oppression. Indeed, the country has the sad distinction of being one of the first victims of Soviet colonial aggression. Under the older and better Lithuania there would be no random arrests for cultural expression, as is the case with Gediminas Jakubcionis, a lighting engineer with the Young People's Theater in Vilnius. There would be no lengthy prison camp sentences for religious devotion, like what Father Sigitas Tamkevicius is being subjected to, a man whose only crime was to help produce a book entitled "Chronicle of the Catholic Church in Lithuania."

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragic state of affairs that a country which has a proud history span-

ning nearly 5,000 years is seeing its language, traditions, and culture enveloped and threatened by an aggressive and ruthless neighbor. I would like to include in the RECORD a statement on Lithuania's national holiday by the Lithuanian National Foundation:

NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION, NONRECOGNITION OF ANNEXATION, SOLIDARITY

February 16, 1987 marks the 69th anniversary since the restoration of Lithuania's national independence. This independence became victim of the Stalin-Hitler pact of 1939 and of Soviet military aggression of 1940. Lithuania remains an occupied country, where any attempt to celebrate the National Holiday is brutally suppressed. Yet, today, as in 1940, the Lithuanian people refuse to accept the foreign occupation and to resign themselves to a perennial status as the subjects of the last colonial empire.

The articles in this issue (ELTA, February 1987) focus on three themes. The first one is the principle of national self-determination, which is enshrined in the United Nations Charter, the Helsinki agreements, and other important international documents. Even the Kremlin has to pay lip-service to that principle, although it constantly reminds its subjects at home that self-determination is an "impossible dream" and that the nations of the empire will be forever ruled by the Russian Communist clique. This remains the official policy under Gorbachev, despite his professions of "openness" and "justice."

The second theme is nonrecognition of annexation. Moscow is stepping up its disinformation campaign, designed to convince the Western powers that they should accept the "inevitable" and to accept Soviet Russian hegemony in the Baltic States. One of the chief Soviet arguments is that by signing the Helsinki agreements, the Western powers have accepted the present boundaries in Europe, including Moscow's control in the Baltic States. This argument, which is sometimes repeated even by Western politicians and journalists, is patently false. In the Helsinki agreements, the States-signatory have pledged not to change the boundaries by force—a solution which is advocated neither by the captive Balts, nor by the Western powers. At the same time, the Helsinki agreements emphasize the right of nations—including the Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians—to self-determination. There is nothing in the Helsinki agreements that could be construed as justifying the forcible incorporations of nations into the Soviet Empire. Moscow's deals with the Nazis are not sacrosanct in the eyes of international law and cannot be accepted by the international community, as emphasized by the steadfast U.S. policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

Solidarity is the third theme of this issue. It is Baltic solidarity with the other captive nations of the Soviet empire as well as with the Russian democrats and human rights activists, such as Andrei Sakharov, who are supporting the right of Baltic nations to determine their own destinies. The bonds of solidarity also link Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians with the nations of Central and Eastern Europe that are struggling to shed the Kremlin's control. And, finally, it is the solidarity with the

Western nations, whose support is so important for the Baltic cause.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, this special order represents our solidarity with the Lithuanian people around the world who struggle against attempts to deny them their identity as people. The continuing struggle mirrors the emotions and trials shown by Americans over the last 200 years.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

MOSCOW ON THE PACIFIC—SOVIET ADVENTURISM IN THE WESTERN PACIFIC

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, with the success of Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev's efforts to improve Moscow's image in the West, it has become apparent that the United States may face its most dangerous adversary since the death of Stalin. Over the past 2 months, the Kremlin has released Dr. Andrei Sakharov from internal exile, pardoned dissidents Josif Begun and Anatoly Koryagin, and hosted an international conference on peace that featured everyone from espionage novelist Graham Greene to "Amerika" star Kris Kristofferson. Regrettably, many in the West have concluded on the basis of this skimpy evidence that Mr. Gorbachev has turned over a new leaf. In taking this view, these optimists seem to be swimming against three undercurrents of reality. First, thousands of dissidents—including Serafim Yevsyukov and Leonid Volvolsky—remain in prison and labor camps. Second, Natan Scharansky, William Hyland of Foreign Affairs magazine, and former United Nations Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick have all stated categorically in recent weeks that the new Soviet emigration laws will actually diminish the number of persons leaving the Soviet Union. Third, the Soviets have shown no willingness to permit the Afghan people to settle their own destiny and have continued their brutal campaign to subdue that society. By recognizing how the West might be diverted from these larger concerns through titillating announcements, Mr. Gorbachev has established himself as a Soviet statesman of rare sophistication. In the short term, the United States can best respond to that sophistication

through an effort at a deeper understanding of the Soviet Union's actual strengths and America's potential weakness.

In this context, we must reexamine the evolving superpower relationship in the Western Pacific, because the combination of an expanding Soviet presence in that region and American miscalculations could create a security danger for the United States. The Soviet Union has established a credible challenge to American power in the Pacific by multiplying the strength of its Armed Forces and expanding the scope of its diplomatic actions. While a resurgent U.S. Navy guarantees the safety of our Pacific interests as of February 1987, debates over Federal defense and trade priorities raise doubts about the future. Few Americans realize that untoward changes in the Pacific balance of power will impinge on both our Government and our society as a whole.

When General Secretary Gorbachev announced in Vladivostok last July that his government would play a major role in the East Asia of the future, he was making a statement of fact, not a prediction. Through its expansion of support facilities, weaponry and intelligence capabilities, Moscow has revolutionized the strategic structure of the Western Pacific. During a visit to Japan last year, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger observed that the Soviet Pacific forces "have moved beyond what anyone might reasonably define as a defense posture, and they have assembled a clearly offensive arsenal." Similarly, the Japanese Defense Agency has expressed concern over what it has called a "relentless buildup" by the Soviet military. And Prof. Peter Palomka of the Australian National University has gone so far as to say that "the Pacific region is destined to become the main focus of superpower rivalry." The Soviet lunge for a new status in the Pacific has generated an upheaval in Western thinking about East Asia.

The American news media has not ignored this upheaval. In an essay entitled "Challenge in the Pacific: Moscow's Growing Naval Strength," Clyde Haberman of the New York Times describes the deep concern felt by American, Japanese, and Australian officials over the injection of Soviet influence into the Pacific theater. According to Mr. Haberman, "the growth of Soviet military power is seen by many Western observers as an increasing threat to American influence in the Pacific. At the least, the United States is now forced into the unwelcome position of having to compete hard in a region that is used to consider its own." Haberman cites an interview with Mike Mansfield in which our envoy to Japan said that he did not feel comfortable with the present level of de-

fensive strength mustered by America and its allies. "The very size of the [Soviet] Pacific fleet, [Mansfield] said, coupled with its expansion into new Pacific regions, spells danger by definition." Ambassador Mansfield expressed specific concerns about the tonnage and improving capabilities of the Soviet navy in a July 1985, article in the Los Angeles Times. That article, entitled "Soviet Pacific Fleet Buildup Poses Threat," cited a report by the Joint Chiefs of Staff from early 1985. That report concluded that the Kremlin's buildup had established an "unfavorable balance" of forces in the Pacific that has "continued to deteriorate." Japanese analysts have also expressed dismay over the recent strategic developments. The Times article states: "As the Soviets eye opportunities to convert their new military muscle into political advantage—in the turbulent Philippines or Indonesia, for example—the region must face the risk of another 'hot' war for decades to come, said Masashi Nishiara of Japan's National Defense Academy." From these news reports, one can surmise that the Soviets have not been subtle in their adventurism. This is disturbing because it suggests great confidence on the part of the Kremlin in any political consequences that may result from its buildup in the region.

In "The Soviets at Cam Ranh Bay," an essay for the spring 1986 issue of the National Interest, Prof. Alvin Bernstein of the Naval War College outlines the basis for Soviet brashness. In Professor Bernstein's view, Moscow has laid the foundations for policies in the Pacific that could reorder the entire superpower rivalry. The professor describes multiple Soviet goals in the region.

First, Moscow seeks in the event of war to blunt any United States counteroffensive against Soviet Asia.

Second, Moscow hopes to better exploit opportunities and defuse threats which arise in the Far East. According to Professor Bernstein, the Soviet stations in Vietnam may prove particularly useful in this context. In his words, they permit the Russians: (a) To constrain United States power projection in the area by presenting the United States with possibility of superpower confrontation; (b) to provide support to pro-Soviet Communist insurgents should they become active in the region at some future date; (c) to counter any future Chinese submarine threat; (d) to facilitate rapid reaction between and in the Indian Ocean and South Pacific; and (e) to use in any limited, regional conflict involving only local powers like the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, and the member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. If Professor Bernstein has accurately assessed the Soviet agenda, it would appear that

Soviet ambitions in Asia are just as great as anywhere else in the world.

Unfortunately, Soviet ambitions in this part of the world may correspond to their military resources. In terms of support facilities, the Soviets have made major strides over the past 5 years. They have gained access to naval and air force facilities at Cam Ranh Bay and Da Nang in Vietnam, and to the ports of Kompong Som and Ream in Cambodia. According to Professor Bernstein, "The establishment of an electronic intelligence gathering facility at Cam Ranh Bay is expected to handle regional communications for the Soviet Navy and Air Force in both the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea, and access to the ports of Kompong Som and Ream increases the range of Soviet naval power." One should also note that the Soviet Indian Ocean fleet uses Cam Ranh Bay—their largest naval facility outside the Warsaw Pact—as a service and repair base. As if to emphasize the importance of Cam Ranh Bay to Moscow's Pacific strategy, the Soviets have recently bolstered its defenses by adding six surface-to-air missile sites and a squadron of interceptor aircraft. Naturally, such defenses not only protect the base in an absolute sense, but they allow the Soviets to project force with a diminished likelihood of effective reprisal.

And the Soviets have plenty of force to project. The Soviet Pacific fleet now comprises 32 percent of all Soviet naval assets (as compared to 25 percent in 1965). It numbers some 800 ships and some 120 submarines, half of which are nuclear-powered. By way of comparison, I should mention that the U.S. 7th Fleet has approximately 70 ships, and the U.S. 3d Fleet (which normally operates in the Eastern Pacific) has 160. The number of Soviet submarines in the Pacific almost equal the total deployed by the entire United States Navy. Traditionally, the Soviets have compensated for their numerical superiority by constructing vessels of low quality. Over the past 10 years, however, Moscow has bolstered both the quality as well as the quantity of its naval presence in the waters of East Asia. The Soviet Pacific fleet possesses two of the Soviet Navy's three vertical or short take-off landing aircraft carriers; between 30 and 40 Backfire air-to-surface missile bombers; and one of the Navy's two large amphibious ships. In his article, Professor Bernstein draws particular attention to the arrival of a new Soviet surface action group in the Pacific unit. The action group consists, he writes, "of a *Kirov*-class nuclear powered guided missile cruiser * * * and two guided missile destroyers * * *. All three ships are less than 2 years old, and their transfer from the Soviet Northern Fleet and the Baltic Fleet late in August indicates a commitment

to boost significantly the capability of the Soviet Pacific Fleet." Obviously, a commitment to the quality of the Soviet fleet suggests a commitment to the vigor of Soviet policies in that region.

The Soviets have worked hard to improve their overall naval capabilities as well. Adm. Carlisle Trost, Chief of Naval Operations, has admitted that the rapid pace of qualitative improvements in Soviet capabilities took the Navy somewhat by surprise when it conducted a review in 1984. According to Tom Stefanick of the Federation of American Scientists, the Soviets have embarked on a major effort to construct quieter submarines. As Mr. Stefanick notes, "Submarine quieting has a dual effect: it makes Soviet [ballistic missile submarines] less detectable, making them less reliant on attack submarines for support, and thereby freeing Soviet [attack submarines] for other missions; it also makes those [attack submarines] better able to transit NATO acoustic surveillance and approach Western sea lines and coasts." The Washington Post reported in September of last year that the Kremlin has assigned 13 elite research institutes the task of finding new ways to detect American submarines. According to Richard Halloran of the New York Times, the CIA believes that techniques other than sonar, including synthetic aperture radar, infrared, magnetic or laser sensors could possibly create a breakthrough in such detection.

In Northeastern Asia, the Soviets have assembled a military presence that may be specifically designed to intimidate neighboring countries. Over the past 20 years, they have increased their ground forces in Soviet Asia from 200,000 to 450,000. They have deployed 165 SS-20 medium-range nuclear missiles in the same region, despite the fact that Japan has no nuclear weapons. Since 1978, Moscow has maintained more than 10,000 ground troops and 40 Mig-23's in the Kurile Islands, part of the disputed "Northern territories" seized by Stalin in the aftermath of the Second World War. And Japanese intelligence experts believe they have discovered the tracks of Soviet miniature submarines on the ocean floor between the home islands of Hokkaido and Honshu. In the event of a war, the Soviets would use such submarines to transport special forces units that has been trained to disrupt the economic and political infrastructure of enemy countries.

Adherents of the Clausewitz doctrine that one cannot segregate war from political relations, the Soviets have labored for the disruption of the status quo through diplomatic initiatives as well. They have achieved precisely such a disruption in the South Pacific. In January 1986, the U.S.S.R.

invited representatives of South Pacific governments to Moscow for a discussion of the Ratanonga treaty, which bans the stationing, production, and testing of nuclear weapons in the region. During the conference, the Soviets suggested that the accord prohibit the transit of nuclear-armed warships and nuclear-armed aircraft through the area. Two months later, Soviet Foreign Minister Edward Shevardnadze announced that the U.S.S.R. had no objections to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. The Soviet official newspaper *Izvestia* noted in June that the Kremlin had formed a Pacific Ocean Department within the Foreign Ministry.

These and other diplomatic efforts have paid substantial dividends to the Soviet Union. In 1985, the state of Kiribati, formerly known as the Gilbert Islands signed an agreement with the Soviet Union which permitted the use of its economic zone by Soviet fishing trawlers. As defectors from the Soviet commercial fleet have repeatedly observed, the Soviets frequently employ such trawlers as part of their intelligence and reconnaissance operations. Given the proximity of United States missile testing facilities in the Marshall Islands, the Soviets could have obtained tangible intelligence benefits from the Kiribati treaty.

Thanks in part to a concerted effort by United States diplomats, Kiribati ended its relationship with the Soviets last fall. However, Moscow soon concluded a new agreement with the Republic of Vanuatu that recouped their position. The treaty permits: First, the access of Soviet fishing trawlers to the Coral Sea; second, the establishment of Soviet ground support facilities for its purportedly commercial activities; third, the use of the port of Palikula for the replenishment of Soviet vessels; and fourth, the use of the airport by Aeroflot, the Soviet airline. Australian Foreign Minister Bill Hayden has stated that once the Soviets arrive, "they will do things that have nothing to do with commercial purposes." Given the location of Vanuatu within the Melanesian Archipelago, he is probably right. The Vanuatu Republic adjoins the troubled French territory of New Caledonia. The Soviets will undoubtedly take a keen interest in the political unrest which continues there. And their intelligence operatives may keep an eye on the French warships which are based at Noumea in New Caledonia. The leader of Vanuatu's opposition party, Vincent Boulekone, concurs with these suspicions. "The Russians want to control the South Pacific," he stated in January. "If they get a base in Vanuatu, they will use it to interfere directly in the affairs of New Caledonia, the Solomon Islands, Fiji, and other countries."

A January 22 report on the South Pacific in the *Washington Times* seems to justify his anxiety. As I noted earlier, the Government of Japan has reservations about the growing Soviet presence in the Western Pacific. The Japanese have initiated a program of student exchanges and technology exchanges with South Pacific nations. In addition, they have promised the delivery of economic aid to the region, although no decisions have yet been made as to the amount. How has Moscow taken the news of this modest effort? Not well at all. Radio Moscow denounced the plan on two separate occasions last month. In the second broadcast, the Soviets claimed that the Japanese were "promoting realization of the United States strategic plans for the Asian and Pacific regions." Such a reaction may surprise in light of recent Soviet attempts to improve relations with Tokyo: Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Japan in January of last year, and the Soviet Union has permitted small groups of Japanese to visit the graves of relatives in the Kurile Islands. While Mr. Gorbachev may have been sincere in his call at Vladivostok for economic prosperity in the Pacific, he evidently prefers that prosperity be of the Socialist variety.

Unfortunately, political upheaval may indeed permit the Soviets to play a larger role in the South Pacific in the future. According to Daniel Abele of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, "The Republics of Kiribati and Vanuatu are two of nine independent island nations that have gained their independence from Britain and France during the past 10 years. A political awakening is occurring in the region as a new generation of leaders has emerged confident and independent. Coupled with this is a rising spirit of nationalism that stems from economic grievances, local anticolonial movements, and dissatisfaction with perceived indifference on the part of the West to local needs." In more specific terms, anticolonialism, antinuclear sentiment, and political radicalism in the South Pacific have all joined together to constrict United States security options in that region. The Labor Governments of Australia and New Zealand, along with several South Pacific regimes, have insisted that America sign the protocols to the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone. If the United States refuses to sign, we will align ourselves with France, whose policies in New Caledonia and whose continued testing of nuclear weapons in the region has generated ill will among the nations of the South Pacific. If we do sign, the security consequences could prove disastrous.

In a December 1, 1986, essay for the *Wall Street Journal*, Peter Samuel, the Washington correspondent for the Australian national newspaper in

Australia, examined the precise constraints that the free zone accord would place on our conventional and nuclear deterrence capabilities. Spinfizz, as the accord is popularly known, would prohibit nuclear testing in the South Pacific. More importantly it would bar the stationing of nuclear weapons on any South Pacific island—including American Samoa. Mr. Samuel observes that such a provision, with an American signature under it, would compound our present difficulties in securing Micronesian acceptance of American military bases. If the Government of the Philippines decided to terminate American use of the Clark and Subic Bay stations, the United States would have a desperate need for alternative sites in Micronesia. As Mr. Samuel puts it, "Nothing would suit the Soviets better than to force the United States to concentrate all its Pacific nuclear weapons on the tiny island of Guam." Australia's opposition party shares Mr. Samuel's qualms. According to the opposition party's foreign affairs spokesman, Andrew Peacock, the treaty "restricts the United States, yet the Soviet Union's power base at Cam Ranh Bay will be unaffected." Peacock adds that Spinfizz could "straitjacket successive Australian governments from offering home porting facilities to the United States Navy, or base facilities to nuclear-capable aircraft or ground units." Given the pivotal role that Australia now plays, and that Micronesia might play, in our naval operations, Spinfizz could result in the demobilization of American strength throughout the South Pacific. One can safely presume that the possibility of that development has contributed to Moscow's strong support for a nuclear free zone.

Of course, the Kremlin has launched diplomatic offensives in other areas of the Pacific Rim. According to the authoritative Soviet Military Power, an annual publication of the Department of Defense, the U.S.S.R. has reconstructed its relationship with Kim Il-sung, the independent-minded dictator of one of the world's most closed societies. The exchange of Soviet weaponry for intelligence capabilities has constituted the core of the new North Korea-Moscow axis. The report states:

The delivery of MIG-23/Flogger aircraft to North Korea has been the most significant trend in the improving bilateral relationship. A total of 35 to 45 such aircraft are expected to be delivered. A limited number of surface-to-air missiles . . . have been delivered to North Korea. This is the first concrete evidence of an agreement by Moscow to renew deliveries of sophisticated new military equipment to North Korea.

In exchange, it appears that the Soviets have received permission to make military overflights of North Korea. Increased activity is expected for both intelligence collection and strike mission simulation. These flights have been made by TU-16 Badger reconnaissance aircraft, TU-95 Bear G strike

aircraft, and TU-95 Bear D naval intelligence collectors.

One important result of Soviet support has been an improvement in overall military relations. To mark the end of World War II in Europe, Soviet, and North Korea fighter units in early May of 1985 conducted their first exchange visits. In late summer, to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the liberation of Korea from Japan, the Soviets sent a record number of delegates and three naval combatants—one *Kara*-class guided missile cruiser and two *Krivak*-class guided missile frigates. This was the first such port call to North Korea by major Soviet naval combatants.

In sum, it appears that North Korea has moved from the position of fellow traveler to that of fellow soldier in the war against capitalism. Given the many United States military installations in Japan and given that the submarine bastions of the Soviet Asian coast would play a critical role in the outcome of any United States-Soviet conflict, one should not underestimate the intelligence implications of the deepening integration of North Korea into Moscow's orbit.

In the long run, however, the West faces a far greater danger from the expansion of the Kremlin's traditional diplomatic campaigns in Southeast Asia and China. This is despite the fact that Moscow's ambitions have to date undermined the effectiveness of these diplomatic efforts. During his speech at Vladivostok, Mr. Gorbachev called for the normalization of Sino-Vietnamese relations and closer ties between Communist Indochina and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Vietnam's neighbors have been unable to see the wisdom of such developments. They cannot forget that the Soviets have supplied both Hanoi and the puppet regime in Pnom Penh with billions in dollars of military aid over the past 7 years. Nor can they forget that the Soviets fund a war which, in the view of Prince Sihanouk's son, may soon result in the extinction of the Cambodian civilization.

General Secretary Gorbachev also used the Vladivostok speech to proclaim his commitment to better Sino-Soviet relations. To placate Chinese unhappiness over the continuing occupation of Afghanistan, the Soviet leader announced that the U.S.S.R. would withdraw six regiments from Afghan soil. He stated that his government would examine "the question of withdrawing a considerable number of Soviet troops from Mongolia." He accepted the Chinese position on the location of the Sino-Soviet border along the Amur River. He urged cooperation between the two countries in the construction of a railway between one province in China and Kazakhstan in the U.S.S.R. To bolster the credibility of his words, Gorbachev appointed Igor Rogachev, the deputy foreign minister, to the post of chief negotiator in the ninth round of Sino-Soviet

talks. The Soviets and the Chinese held their first inter-parliamentary talks in August of last year. And in September, Gorbachev sent Nikolay Talyzin, chairman of the Soviet State Planning Commission, to China to discuss "relevant questions in economic and planning work."

It's clear that Mr. Gorbachev has not succeeded in transforming Sino-Soviet relations. Following the Vladivostok speech, the People's Republic of China's Foreign Minister remarked, "We cannot determine now whether the Soviet Union is still seeking hegemony or has changed its strategy for Hegemony." The Foreign Ministry elaborated on that statement by asking Moscow to demonstrate the sincerity of its rhetoric by "greatly reducing nuclear weapons and missiles already deployed and easing the tension in the region and removing the hot spots of Afghanistan and Kampuchea." China's senior statesman, Deng Xiaoping, has even predicated a meeting with Gorbachev on a reversal of Soviet policy vis-a-vis Cambodia. Given these prerequisites, it's difficult to see the light at the end of the tunnel when it comes to a warming of Sino-Soviet ties.

Nevertheless, we should not dismiss the Gorbachev diplomatic offensive in China simply because it has not come to fruition. On the contrary, the West should look on it with grave concern, for two reasons. First, Gorbachev's efforts have not been a shot in the dark. They have been a comprehensive assault on the adversarial character of the relationship with China—an assault that addresses the full range of cultural, economic, and security tensions in a tangible manner that the Chinese cannot help but notice. Gorbachev's approach signals a keen understanding of Asia and a tremendous will to succeed on this front or on another front if he fails in China. The second reason is obvious: Any rapprochement with the Chinese would destroy a lynchpin of international deterrence to Soviet aggression.

In some respects, the fervor with which the Soviets approach their diplomatic and military enterprises reflects on the strength of their adversary. If, as Professor Bernstein of the Naval War College believes, the Kremlin seeks to undercut the confidence of Asia and Oceania in America's resolve and ability to support that resolve, then the Reagan administration and the Department of the Navy have made the fulfillment of Soviet goals a difficult achievement. The relationship between the superpower relationship in the Pacific and our defense policies has been underscored by Professor Palomka of the Australian National University. In "The Security of the Western Pacific: The Price of Burden Sharing," an essay for the journal *Survival*, he writes:

The importance of perceptions in international politics, especially in times of rapid change, and the paramount position of the "American factor" in the calculations of most Western Pacific states, suggests that the security outlook in the region during the 1980s will be largely shaped by perceptions of where the U.S. stands in the regional superpower naval balance and how well she handles relations with Japan and China.

As James L. George of the Center for Naval Analyses, a division of the Hudson Institutes, has observed, the defense policies of the Reagan administration have put the Navy in better shape than it has been for over a decade. Writing in "The U.S. Navy: A View From the Mid-1980's," Mr. George lists Secretary Lehman's steadfast support for a 600-ship force, improvements in readiness and the resolution of personnel dilemmas as justifications for this conclusion. His assessment generally concurs with those of Donald Daniel of the Naval Postgraduate School and Gale Tarleton of the Defense Intelligence Agency, who, while writing in the same volume, suggest that a significant improvement has occurred in our military capabilities in the Pacific. "Certainly among the reasons," they explain:

Are the renewed appreciation in U.S. policy of the importance of the Pacific area, the reversal in the downward trend in U.S. Pacific Fleet force numbers, foreseeable progress toward the 600-ship navy with its 15 carrier battle groups, the restocking of ammunition and spare parts, the deployment of modern fighter aircraft (the F-15, F-16, and F/A-18) in Korea and Japan able to intercept outbound Soviet antiship bombers, and the introduction into the fleet of the Aegis air-defense system capable of handling multiple targets simultaneously.

Improvements such as these justify the new confidence about the U.S. Navy that Messrs. Tarleton and Daniel have discovered in East Asian capitals. This confidence in turn assures that America maintains its place as the most influential power in the Pacific.

This same confidence, however, relies not only on the commitments of the President, but of the Congress as well. Congress has restrained the reconstruction of our defense throughout the Reagan years, slicing administration requests for increases in Navy personnel by 9,000 for fiscal year 1983, by 7,000 for fiscal year 1984 and by 4,000 in fiscal year 1985. Yet as the *National Journal* reported in its February 21 edition, fiscal year 1986 marked the actual demise of consensus between Capitol Hill and White House on defense spending. "Newtonian realities reasserted themselves in fiscal 1986," the article states, "when defense appropriations dropped by 4.2 percent, and again in the current fiscal year, when they fell by another 2.5 percent." Remarkably, the same Congress that called for responsible defense spending last year took 22 percent of the fiscal year 1987 budget

cuts out of maintenance, spare parts, ammunition, and other readiness-related programs, and 33 percent of the cuts through procurement stretch-outs that usually cost the taxpayer more of his money in the long run. The Journal adds that the House and Senate took only 8 percent of the cuts from programmatic changes.

Many of the nations of Asia and Oceania are too small to even dream of repulsing Communist aggression. Others are too poor to afford a respectable military. And still others have antimilitary traditions which make them reluctant to build up their armed forces. These nations know that the Soviet Union has the resolve to carry out its global priorities. They depend on the United States for the same degree of commitment. The abandonment of our plans for a 600-ship Navy, continued cuts in the readiness capabilities on which our sailors and soldiers rely, and further delays in the deployment of the weapons systems which help to form our conventional deterrent posture will leave our friends in the Western Pacific with an understandable basis for doubts about our enthusiasm for either the Reagan doctrine or traditional containment policies. While it is very popular on Capitol Hill for politicians to call themselves "cheap hawks," we need to remind ourselves that you can't be a cheap hawk if you don't have any wings.

Congress may generate more anxiety in the Pacific if it approves the protectionist trade legislation which the leadership backed last year and has endorsed again this year. Professor Bernstein notes that "protectionist policies could become a serious obstacle to plans for both formal and de facto security cooperation." Frankly, I find it surprising that many of the same Representatives and Senators who decry our supposed ignorance of the domestic realities of other countries in the conduct of our foreign policy now say that we must initiate tariffs and other forms of economic retaliation against our trade partners. Do they really believe that these nations will stand idly by and simply accept the economic programs that we dictate to them? Do they not recognize that each of the governments involved depends for its continuation in power not on the goodwill of U.S. special interests, but on the support of employers and employees whose jobs often depend on exports to America? Ultimately, Congress will have to face the reality that not only will restrictions on international commerce punish our consumers through higher prices and fewer products, but that we live in a world where the political concerns of the United States are intertwined with the economic priorities of its allies. It is my hope that we will learn that lesson before we attempt to enact pro-

tectionist legislation, not after states in East Asia and Oceania begin to reconsider their friendship with a power that closes its doors to the exports that keep their voters employed.

□ 1530

No one would suggest that we ought to be the patsies of the world in international trade. To suggest that rampant protectionist legislation, dealing with just gross numbers, or specifically aimed at the Pacific rim of the world is something that is going to assist us either economically or in a national security sense is just not correct.

We have got to be very, very careful about what we do, and we have to recognize the implications internationally not only of our economic policy but of our military policy as well.

Unfortunately, the adage of some wits of the past that "if we do not allow goods to cross borders, troops will" is just as viable today as it was then.

So as we look at things in our own particular way, in our own parochial way as we all have in the Congress of the United States, let us not forget the overall implications for peace in the Pacific when we deal with trade this year.

Perhaps Congress will look more closely at the implications for the Pacific of its trade and defense decisions if it gains a better appreciation for the stakes involved in strategic changes there. Many Senators and Representatives know that we need secure routes for the shipment of oil from Indonesia and the Arab States. Many may know that in order to project force and protect our interests worldwide, we need bases in the Pacific basin. They may not realize the extent of interdependence between the United States and the economies of the Western Pacific. In the New York Times' September 7, 1986, discussion of Soviet activities in the region, Clyde Haberman observes:

American bilateral trade with Asia, Australia and New Zealand has more than tripled in the last 10 years, reaching \$202 billion in 1985. That equals, almost to the dollar, the United States total worldwide trade as recently as 1975. Over the last decade, trade with Asia and the Pacific has increased from 29 to 36 percent of overall American foreign commerce, and presumably will keep rising.

In testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on December 11 of last year, Prof. Hugh Patrick of Columbia University amplified on these statistics. He observed that:

The American economy is now more involved in the world economy than ever before in its history, not only absolutely but also relative to its total production, investment and consumption. Over the past two decades the share of exports plus imports of goods and services has virtually doubled to more than one-fifth of the U.S. gross national product.

Since America now trades more often with the Pacific basin nations than with any other region, including Western Europe, it should be clear that the economic vitality and buying power of our Pacific trading partners influence the basic health and selling power of our own economy. We cannot be isolationist in our trade policies any more than we can return to the days of a "fortress America" attitude toward our global defense posture.

The people from my part of the country, Mr. Speaker, understand that Pacific Rim trade is absolutely important. Many jobs are intimately connected with Pacific Rim trade. While we have those who export and we have jobs that are connected with export, and while we recognize that we are not allowed into those markets as we wish we would, we would plead with the Congress not to overstep retaliatory action.

That is, not to take it upon itself to impose upon this administration or any other administration a unilateral attitude toward retaliation that does not take into consideration what we are going to get out of it in the end.

Punishing other countries because of their failing, real and imagined, in the area of free trade, may come back to hurt us even more. In the long run we will lose American jobs just as well as those countries will lose their jobs. Maybe those of us in the West will just lose more jobs and lose jobs more quickly than the rest of the country, but Mr. Speaker, our entire country would be affected by an unfortunate turn to protectionism in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we do not now face an imminent danger to our vital interests in the Pacific. But such a danger may develop if we do not learn to take the internal politics of our friends as seriously as the Soviets do. Vigorous Soviet efforts to improve ties with the States of the Western Pacific suggest that they maintain a careful watch on the attitudes of those countries to the United States. Through a resolute and credible defense posture and through trade policies that open markets rather than close them, we must ensure that Moscow has no easy opportunities. The consequences of such opportunities can hit too close to the homes of every American.

THE FISCAL 1988 BUDGET: THE CLASS OF 1986 DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS RESPONSE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to

revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleagues of the class of 1986 Democratic caucus in presenting what we believe to be a unique and important perspective on the current deliberations over the proposed fiscal 1988 Federal budget.

As the newest Members of this distinguished body, we came to Washington with a fresh message from our constituents. Our presence here today reflects the strong concern expressed by those constituents last November over the trends in this administration's budget and policy proposals and their concerns about this administration's priorities.

Our family farmers face the worst crisis—a crisis threatening their very survival—since the Great Depression. Education funding has been sharply reduced by this administration despite warnings that our competitiveness is suffering in this area, one which is crucial to our Nation's future. Our elderly population remains fearful that benefits they have counted on will be subject to new cuts or new costs. Our college-age students face increasingly uncertain futures because of their concern that college costs may soon be out of their economic reach. Our non-military research and development efforts continue to be the target of new proposals to reduce funding by this administration, despite the vital role R&D will play in restoring this Nation's status as a world trader. Our rural areas and the great heartland of this Nation continue to hear talk of an economic recovery, yet see no signs of a recovery of their main streets.

Last week, during the President's Day recess, our caucus members had the opportunity to return to their districts for the first time since the administration's budget proposals were fully unveiled. What we heard were our constituents reemphasizing their strong concern over the direction of this latest of administration budget proposals.

I also had the opportunity, as a new member of the House Budget Committee, which held field hearings around the country during the recess, to listen to the concerns of citizens outside my own district. They expressed similar frustration and fear over where the Federal Government is headed and how it will deal with these very real problems.

My colleagues in the class of 1986 Democratic caucus and I have asked for this time today to present our impressions of the administration's proposed budget, particularly in light of the comments and concerns we have heard from our constituents over the

past several weeks. Several members of our caucus will discuss in more detail specific areas within the budget that have raised the most concern. But allow me at the start to reiterate two points about the administration's budget proposal and the difficult task we will face in arriving at a reasonable and fair budget for fiscal 1988.

First, the Congressional Budget Office, as you are all aware, has indicated that the administration's budget will fall short of reaching the deficit reduction target established in the Gramm-Rudman Act. That act calls for a deficit no higher than \$108 billion, while the CBO estimates the deficit under the administration budget would actually be closer to \$135 to \$140 billion. What that means is Congress would have to cut some \$61 billion, an unprecedented amount, out of the Federal budget to reach the current Gramm-Rudman target.

The second problem deals with the issue I have already raised, the issue of where this administration's priorities lie in attempting to make headway on the real problem of the budget deficit.

As Budget Committee Chairman BILL GRAY has eloquently pointed out a number of times, this administration's budget is sharply out of balance when it comes to distributing the pain that will certainly occur as programs are trimmed in order to achieve a lowered deficit.

In the military area, the administration proposes a \$15.4 billion increase in appropriations over the 1987 level. In contrast, the administration calls for deep cuts, or the outright elimination of programs such as assisted housing, rural economic development, education, nutrition, Medicaid, and Medicare. Progress on reducing the deficit, which is of vital importance, cannot and should not be gained at the expense of those in our society who are least able to sustain such a burden.

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the Fourth District of North Carolina is the home of numerous institutions of higher education, including Louisburg College, Meredith College, North Carolina State University, Peace College, St. Augustine's College, St. Mary's College, Shaw University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Randolph Technical College, and Wake Technical College. We know the value of higher education. We know what it means for our standard of living and for our quality of life. We know what education contributes to economic progress, to opening the doors of opportunity, and to developing an active, well-informed citizenry.

But North Carolinians also fear, Mr. Speaker, that the present administration is blind to the fundamental importance of higher education for the continued economic and intellectual growth of America. We see the administration forgetting that every dollar spent on education is an investment that will pay future dividends in prosperity and enlightenment. We see an administration willing to cut the routes of access to education upon which all but our wealthiest students depend.

In its fiscal year 1988 budget plan, the administration seeks to disqualify some 3 million students from eligibility for Federal student aid by eliminating four student aid programs—supplemental grants, college work-study programs, national direct student loans, and State student incentive programs—and drastically cutting a fifth—the Pell Grant Program—that have allowed millions of ambitious young people to receive the educations they desire and deserve. At just one of the universities in my district, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, these cuts would mean that more than 3,000 students would be denied needed financial assistance.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, these proposals are being offered by the administration at a time when students and their parents are already facing staggering increases in the costs of education. More students are taking out larger loans each year. Students are finding themselves limited in their career choices as a result of heavy indebtedness. How can we attract students to essential but low-paying careers, such as teaching, when they realize that a large portion of their already small salaries must go to repay heavy debts?

Mr. Speaker, as one whose career has been in higher education, I have administered student loan and work-study programs for several years. I can testify from firsthand experience that these are not wasteful or extravagant programs. On the contrary, student aid budgets have been austere, and our resources have never been sufficient to assist all of those deserving help.

Now the administration threatens to worsen this already unacceptable situation by cutting back on grants and work-study options while increasing student loan interest rates and charging higher fees for loan administration.

At best, Mr. Speaker, these educational budget proposals are shortsighted. The President gives lip service to the theme of "competitiveness" while simultaneously proposing to shut the doors of educational opportunity to millions of Americans. In his State of the Union Address, Mr. Reagan spoke with reverence of the benefits of education while at the same time intro-

ducing a budget that would limit the access to that education for deserving students from families of low and moderate income.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that these are times that demand discrimination and restraint in Government spending. All items in the Federal budget, including education programs, must be scrutinized and tested for efficiency and effectiveness. But we must see spending for quality education and for broadened educational opportunity as an investment in our Nation's future. I strongly believe that today's budget crisis offers an opportunity for ingenuity, judgment, and courage—not an excuse for an attack on higher education. Open access to education has long been a hallmark of the American way. It cannot now be treated as dispensable luxury even in these times of budgetary crisis.

Mr. Speaker, the need of these students for financial assistance is a need that all Americans share for a prosperous future, a vital democracy, and a society of opportunity.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when competitiveness has become a buzz word for solving our trade deficit problems, the administration's budget would decimate the education budget, critical to educating tomorrow's work force and reeducating today's displaced workers. How can we expect to have workers with the skills to fill the jobs which are necessary to be truly competitive in world trade markets if we reduce elementary and secondary education budgets by 18 percent and college student aid assistance by 45 percent?

The administration's budget would completely eliminate nine major elementary and secondary education programs, including the complete elimination of all vocational educational programs.

How can the administration ever hope to have a truly competitive and effective work force if it completely eliminates vocational education, that part of our educational system designed to prepare students for specific jobs?

Our national security, a subject dear to the heart of this administration, is also at risk because of the great cuts in education budgets. We can produce star wars and other sophisticated weapons systems and spend billions of dollars doing so, but we will lose the battle if we do not have an educated and literate group of personnel who can be trained readily and inexpensively to operate those systems.

It is time that the administration place as much emphasis on the quality of manpower who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces as it places on the quantity of fire power.

The administration proposal to reduce by 45 percent the student aid available to our colleges and universities cuts by almost half the opportunity for middle and lower income students to ever improve their standard of living. These same cuts disproportionately impact on vocational and technical colleges where so many of our students are dependent on work study programs and other loan and grant programs to enable them to remain in school while they also work part time.

Again, the competitive edge which brain power has traditionally provided to this country is undercut and severely damaged perhaps for a full generation unless this Congress acts responsibly and appropriately to these proposed cuts.

Our future lies in the minds of our young people. Let us not neglect to provide the resources necessary to guarantee that future by committing the necessary resources to educating our young people and to the extent possible and necessary.

Mr. ESPY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we as elected officials share a moral obligation to assist in the strengthening of our Nation's foundation. While I recognize the need for a balanced budget and the need to cut the deficit, I believe that it is truly unfair to attempt to balance the budget upon the backs of the needy, the elderly, and our young children. A strong foundation does not include a weak educational system or a nation filled with unemployed individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by several items in the administration's fiscal year 1988 budget. While time does not permit me to address all of the issues of concern to me, I would, however, like to register my concern about the effects of the administration's proposals upon child nutrition programs and historic preservation.

I am particularly concerned about the administration's proposals to eliminate cash and commodity for lunches served to students who do not qualify for a free or reduced price lunch. Unnecessary funding cuts would only serve to eliminate affordable meals, thus eliminating children from access to needed nutritional programs. The School Lunch Program is not a welfare program. It is a nutrition program for all children. Hungry children cannot learn.

Mr. Speaker, another concern that I share with many people in my State of Georgia and with many citizens throughout the country is the proposed cut of funding of State preservation offices. These offices transfer deteriorating eyesores into important landmarks, many of which have become a focal point of national and

local community pride. The loss of the ability to preserve our Nation's landmarks could only be defined as a great tragedy.

The citizens of this land have a right to know what is in the food we eat; what is in the water we drink, and what is in the air we breathe. We must realize that the bounty of the Earth's resources is not ours to hoard, waste, or destroy, but to use only what we need to share and to preserve for future generations.

As a Congress we must demand sufficient food to eliminate hunger, provide housing for the homeless, jobs for the unemployed, quality education for our children, and adequate health care for all Americans. How can we, in good faith, continue to cut programs which are essential to the healthy development of our Nation. The budget must reflect that we are a caring and a sharing society.

□ 1550

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, nearly a month ago Members of Congress were honored to hear President Reagan deliver his State of the Union Address in this great Hall. Over these last 4 weeks, I have studied what the President said, and I have studied what the President's budget proposes. I am struck by the differences. Nowhere is the difference more apparent and the inconsistencies so great, as in the administration's education plans for 1988.

In his State of the Union Address, the President told us that to his own exhortation, "we must strive for excellence in education." In response to his own exhortations, he has proposed a cut of 28 percent in the education budget. He told us that "our children should master the basic concepts of math and science," and then cut math and science teacher training programs. President Reagan announced a goal of raising literacy levels by the year 2000 "to assure that every American—no matter what age—learns to speak, read, and write English," and yet he has proposed a rescission of all 1987 funds for immigrant education and provided no funds for 1988. The President told us that no one should be "left behind" in obtaining an education, and, yet he has proposed cuts of \$253 million, or 15 percent in funds for education for the handicapped.

The cuts to elementary and secondary education are bad enough. But the cuts to higher education are truly devastating. The administration proposes cuts of 29 percent, nearly one-third, in Pell grants, the cornerstone of postsecondary financial aid. The administration would also, for reasons no one seems to be able to explain, completely

do away with the work study programs and the supplemental educational opportunity grants. By way of illustration, the University of Utah, the largest institution of higher learning in my district, would be forced to lay off its 800 working students, and to turn away over 3,000 students who currently receive financial aid in the form of grants or loans.

What possible rationale can the administration provide for such a policy? How can they justify this attack on our educational system?

How can the President justify threatening the quality of preparation for our young people when today's global economy depends upon more and better educational preparation? If we are to give our young the opportunity to compete economically in the world, we must provide them with a competitive education.

We must be concerned that the United States is losing its competitive edge in the international market and yet, the administration's proposed education budget not only fails to address that issue, it makes the problem worse.

Columnist Jack Anderson recently reported that 70 to 90 percent of high school students in Japan and West Germany and the Soviet Union leave high school proficient enough in math and science to begin a technical program in college or at a university. In the United States, by contrast, only 6 percent of high school graduates are so prepared. We cannot expect to maintain our endangered position as the world's technological superpower if we do not provide an adequate education to our young people. The United States cannot afford to adopt such a shortsighted and unwise policy as the President's education budget provides. I urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to reject the administration's proposals for education for 1988 and to substitute, in their place, a budget which recognizes that the highest quality education and preparation for our young are prefatory to solving all our other economic problems. We cannot expect to compete in world markets until we provide our children with competitive quality education. And this administration's vendetta against education is a grave disservice, not only to our children, but to our economic well-being.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication of the Office of Management and Budget downplayed the effect of this administration's disastrous budget for rural America. Incredibly, the OMB claims that—

This budget will not harm rural America. Indeed, by better targeting outdated and poorly focused programs, many of which

were begun in the 1930's and have not been significantly changed, we can put our fiscal house in order and provide the assistance that rural communities deserve.

Everyone recognizes the need for fiscal responsibility and restraint—this country is living beyond its means, and we've got to change that. But is it fair that the area of the country that is experiencing the greatest hardship is being asked to sacrifice the most; that an economy already on its knees should be knocked on its back?

Is it really fair to ask our farmers to absorb all of the following:

Cuts in commodity price supports which will salvage family farm income;

Termination of agricultural stabilization and conservation programs;

Termination of FMHA farm ownership direct loans;

Phaseout of rural electrification programs;

Reductions in Federal assistance for crop insurance;

Reductions in Soil Conservation Service Programs; and

Imposition of user fees on meat and poultry inspections.

Perhaps most distressing about the administration's budget is the apparent belief that there are no interconnections between programs. As farms fall and farm programs fold, rural Americans are compelled to turn to other work. Yet there are no provisions in this budget to deal with displaced farmers. Small Business Administration direct loans are eliminated. Farmer's Home Administration housing and community development programs are terminated. Vocational education funds are eliminated. Where do we expect rural Americans to turn?

The pat answer from the administration is that States should handle these matters. Yet the same economic pressures that are hurting farms are affecting rural States. That is why we have these Federal programs in the first place, because we recognize that as a Nation we are in this together.

□ 1600

A budget that simply passes the buck to rural States and forces them to sink or swim on their own is shortsighted, irresponsible, and unacceptable, and we must do everything in our power to change it and restore sanity and balance to our national budget agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as a first-term Congressman from Maryland's Seventh District, I stand here today as a representative of the thousands of elderly and disabled citizens in my district and for the millions more throughout this Nation who would be adversely affected by the administra-

tion's proposed drastic cuts in Medicare funding in its 1988 budget.

After cutting both Medicare and Medicaid by over \$30 billion since taking office, the President proposes cuts totaling \$6 billion in 1988 and \$22.1 billion over 3 years. The 1988 reductions represent 32 percent of the spending cuts proposed for the entire Federal budget. This is unconscionable.

While I agree that we must look for ways to constrain Government spending in order to reduce the Federal budget, I cannot condone doing it on the backs of our senior citizens.

Furthermore, there is growing evidence that the 27 million Americans who qualify for home health care under Medicare are being unjustly denied help by the Federal Government. Since 1983 when Congress gave hospitals new incentives to save money by shortening the length of stay of Medicare beneficiaries, patients are leaving hospitals sooner and sometimes in greater need of home health care than ever before. But the rate of growth of Medicare reimbursements for home services has declined due to arbitrary interpretation of Medicare law by intermediary insurance companies and a failure, on the part of the Department of Health and Human Services, to rectify the problem. As a result, over 1 million elderly Americans needing home health care are not receiving it according to a recent General Accounting Office report. This must stop. All those who need the care and are entitled to it under the law must receive it.

This administration in its zealous drive toward reducing the deficit has attempted to run roughshod over the health-care needs of our senior citizens. While the President's recently announced catastrophic health care plan is a small step in the right direction, much more is needed to protect the health care needs of the elderly—particularly those who are both elderly and poor. For example, I don't know many elderly poor people who can afford the \$2,000 deductible called for in the President's plan.

Quality health care for the elderly is a necessity, not a frill, and I will work with those who share that view in this 100th Congress to assure the adequate funding of Medicare. The elderly of America deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this year's freshman class in this special order to discuss the Federal budget for fiscal year 1988.

The most pressing domestic economic issue before this Congress is how to

deal with the Federal budget deficit. Everyone agrees the deficit must be reduced. But there is widespread disagreement over how much it should be reduced, or how quickly, or by what combination of spending cuts and revenue increases.

The magic words in the budget debate are still Gramm-Rudman. The institutional crisis we face is the result of the rigid timetables and goals that were set in that legislation.

Gramm-Rudman specified that the budget for fiscal year 1988 contain a deficit of no more than \$108 billion. The target was questionable at the time it was adopted. Events since passage of the legislation have proved it totally unreasonable.

The premise of Gramm-Rudman was that the deficit for fiscal year 1986 would be in the range of \$180 billion, and that by annual reductions of \$36 billion, the budget could be balanced in 5 years. Unfortunately, the actual deficit for 1986 turned out to be \$221 billion, or \$41 billion higher than anticipated.

Congress succeeded in 1987 in reducing the deficit considerably. In fact, from 1986 to 1987 the deficit declined by more than the \$36 billion yearly installment required by the law. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the deficit for this year will be approximately \$176 billion, or \$45 billion lower than the previous year.

While that represents progress, it also falls well short of the deficit target for fiscal year 1987. We were supposed to be coming out of 1987 with a deficit of \$144 billion. If you're starting at \$144 billion, a deficit of \$108 billion is achievable. But if you're starting, as we are, from a deficit of \$176 billion, the spending cuts or tax increases needed to get to \$108 billion could be devastating to our economy.

What should we do this year? Administration officials stand there in their glass houses throwing stones at the Congress, accusing us of contemplating a crime they have already committed.

The administration's budget claims to achieve the Gramm-Rudman target for 1988. In fact, it misses by \$26.8 billion. The rest of the savings they claim are a hodgepodge of rosy economic forecasts and smoke-and-mirrors budgeting.

The challenge we face is not to prove that we can reach some arbitrary target. Deficit reduction is a good thing but you can have too much of a good thing. Congress this year must prove we can adhere to the underlying principles of Gramm-Rudman without committing ourselves to a course that could prove destructive for the economy.

I would favor an approach which would make Gramm-Rudman targets economically meaningful. By tying deficit reduction targets to certain eco-

nomics indicators, we can avoid the mistake of adopting deep spending cuts or revenue increases in a weakened economy. The \$60 billion we would need to cut this year to hit the Gramm-Rudman target would represent a cut of 1.5 percent of GNP. Instead of blindly adhering to arbitrary deficit targets, it would make more sense to tie deficit reduction requirements to the unemployment rate or the rate of growth in the GNP.

The deficit question is too important to put on automatic pilot. It demands careful, reasoned action by an informed, responsible Congress. By holding this special order, we are saying the freshman class is prepared to take that action. We know the choices will be tough.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I yield next to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to just thank everybody for coming here today and listening to this fine set of talks from the freshman class.

In addition, let me say that before I had the opportunity to run for political office, for the last 8 years I have been running a nonprofit energy company called Citizens Energy Corp. Citizens Energy has been able to provide hundreds of thousands of people in my own State of Massachusetts with low-cost heating oil and people in over 22 or 25 other States with low-cost natural gas, electricity, and pharmaceutical drugs, as well as a range of other services. In addition, in the last couple of years we started the first electrical trading company in this country.

I am here today to talk about the energy policy of this Nation. It just seems to me that what we really need in this country is not all the experts that want to come in and tell us about complicated energy policies. What we need in this country is a recognition that energy policy is really quite simple, that cheaper is better, and that in recognizing that if we follow a policy of cheaper is better, we can foster real competition in this country, competition that is going to enable the small businessman to enter into a competitive spirit with the large energy industries that have made up and traditionally provided the power that this Nation needs.

□ 1610

If we look at the industry of oil, oil is perhaps one of the greatest and most competitive industries in our whole energy supply. It is probably also the most effective and efficiently run of all of the energy industries. If we leave the oil industry and begin to take a look at natural gas and electricity, what we find is huge conglomer-

ates that are basically controlling most of the energy that is moved through either the natural gas pipelines in our country or over the electrical power lines. It is about time that we enable small power producers to be able to gain access to the power lines in this country. It is about time that we turned our natural gas pipelines into toll roads that enable all producers to gain the same access that the major pipelines have over the molecules of natural gas that move through those pipelines.

If we could—in our State of Massachusetts, and in our neighboring State of New Hampshire, we are about to embark, I hope, on being able to repeal the need for the Seabrook nuclear powerplant. But if we are not successful, I would just like everybody to understand that we could eliminate the need for Seabrook by simply using the same dollars that went into that powerplant or the same amount of dollars that all of the people in our region of New England will be paying for that power, to simply put in energy conservation measures in our homes and in our places of work.

If we were able to do that, we would completely eliminate the need for not only Seabrook but many other powerplants in the region as well, and make our Nation more free of acid rain and the potential of nuclear disaster.

It seems to me that what we ought to really be doing in this country is questioning our policies that create a situation of socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor and the little guy. Create a situation where we have a level playing field in which all providers of our Nation's energy get an equal footing and an equal opportunity to provide the public with the cheapest possible sources of energy that they deserve.

I thank the Members for their time.

Mr. ESPY. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I next yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a very real privilege to join with my colleagues in this, the 100th Congress. We, the newest Members, face a special challenge as we seek to celebrate perhaps the greatest invention of this Nation, the constitutional system that permits all of us the political freedoms to take part in the wealth of 200 years of growth.

I would like to talk for just a moment today about two other inventions that are just as important in where we have been over the last 200 years. Those two inventions were mentioned perhaps only by reference in a speech that was given 100 years or so ago right now by a Justice of the Supreme Court, Oliver Wendell Holmes,

to a graduating class of Harvard Law School.

In that message he described the greatest service that one can do in a democracy. He suggested that that was:

To see the future as far as one may; to feel the force behind every detail. To try to hammer out products that are sound and compact. To seek to make them first-rate, and to let the results speak for themselves.

For the last 100 years, since that speech, this Nation has exemplified that standard to a world that it has led in becoming the most productive place on the face of the Earth. We did it with those two additional inventions that gave life to that constitutional system. A productive system, a productive capacity that was the world's most efficient. That made it possible for an entire nation to take part in the wealth it produced. An educational system that led the world and equipped that nation to be productive.

Today, we see our Nation emulated by countries around the world to the point where less-developed countries in virtually every corner of this globe have the capacity to replicate those systems that we taught them how to build.

That is what we seek to do here today. To build on the kind of strength that we have seen. To take a look at those concerns that are reflected in the single most critical document that we will examine in this 100th Congress, that budget that embodies all of our hopes and our dreams and our aspirations. That budget that takes a look at the needs of this Nation in terms of energy and agriculture. Its need to come to grips with its own finances and deficits and perhaps most important, our ability to invest in ourselves. To invest in ourselves in terms of productive capacity, in our students and employee development; in education and new capital equipment and new productive plants. It is in this way that we give life to that challenge that Justice Holmes gave us 100 years ago. If we do, then in fact we will have seen the future as far as we need to. We will have felt the force behind every detail.

We will continue to hammer out products that are sound and compact. We will make them first rate, and indeed the results will speak for themselves.

Mr. ESPY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DeFAZIO].

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

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the President's 1988 defense budget request, let's ask ourselves: "After 6 years and more than \$1.5 trillion, are we more or less secure?" And let's ask, "What are the President's priorities, and where are they taking us?"

In his defense budget, there are three big-ticket items with very disturbing implications. The President has asked for \$3.5 billion for the Trident II missile. Its potential as a first strike weapon is obvious. Its ability to destroy Soviet missile silos introduces a new element of uncertainty into an already dangerous game. By increasing the vulnerability of Soviet land-based missiles, we increase the Soviet pressure to "use or lose" its nuclear forces during a crisis.

This budget includes \$402 million for development of an antisatellite weapon. The United States depends to a much greater degree on satellites for communications and surveillance than does the Soviet Union. The current Soviet Asat technology is relatively primitive. It is hardly in our national interest to encourage the Soviets to develop a more efficient Asat capability, which they certainly will if we proceed with this program. A ban on Asat weapons development would be achievable and verifiable.

And, of course, there's star wars.

The President is asking for \$5.2 billion for this program. Cost aside—though \$1 trillion is nothing to sneeze at—the real achilles heel of SDI is the extreme vulnerability of its space-based components to a first strike. This fact has not been lost on the planners at the Pentagon. The President is requesting \$2 billion over the next 2 years for research aimed at defending the defense.

These programs need to be seen for what they are: part of a larger strategy to fight and win a nuclear war. That strategy includes the development of war fighting capabilities that extend our reach into outer space and the continued buildup of our stockpile of nuclear weapons.

You may have seen the article in the Post last Monday. It was a profile of Earnest Fitzgerald, the well-known Air Force whistleblower. I'd like to cite Fitzgerald's first law: There are only two phases of a program. The first is, "It's too early to tell." The second, "It's too late to stop."

It's not too late to stop these three expensive and destabilizing weapons programs. I would ask my colleagues to keep Mr. Fitzgerald's words in mind while considering the President's defense request.

□ 1620

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the members of the 1986 Democratic Caucus, for participating in this special order.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH: 200 YEARS OF EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. COYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, 1987 marks the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution. This monument to our Founding Fathers is the cornerstone of our country's democracy; it is the basis of every American's freedom and liberty.

One key component of our democracy is education. Education has made our country a better place to live; it spurs our hopes and dreams for a better tomorrow.

Nineteen hundred and eighty-seven is also the bicentennial year for one of America's finest academic institutions. February 28 marks the day, 200 years ago, when Hugh Henry Brackenridge founded the Pittsburgh Academy—known today as the University of Pittsburgh.

The story of the University of Pittsburgh begins in 1781 when Brackenridge assessed his life and his opportunities for advancement in Philadelphia. Brackenridge came to the conclusion that his opportunities lay elsewhere. Brackenridge wrote, "I saw no chance for being anything in that city, there were such great men before me." It was this desire for a better life that pushed Brackenridge westward, across the Allegheny Mountains to the small outpost on the western frontier—Pittsburgh.

Upon reaching the town, Brackenridge settled and decided to begin an institution for higher education. He wrote, "My object was to advance the country—western Pennsylvania—and thereby advance myself," to plant the values of enlightenment in the lives of the people.

In its first years of existence, the Pittsburgh Academy could hardly be considered an institution for higher education. Basic courses in arithmetic, writing, and geometry were taught, and as it is documented "in the course of one quarter, one [could] learn the whole process of making an almanac."

Brackenridge and the school's trustees knew that Pittsburgh still had no true college. The trustees recognized that the academy was "inadequate to the accommodation and complete education of the student." Anyone desiring a higher education still had to travel hundreds of miles to one of the established universities on the eastern seaboard.

In 1818 the trustees petitioned the Pennsylvania State legislature, and in 1819 a charter was approved for the maintenance of the university.

The history of the University of Pittsburgh reflects the diversity of the ethnic groups that settled in and around the city of Pittsburgh. Throughout the late 1800's and early 1900's millions of immigrants flocked to the United States. Scots, Irish, Germans, Italians, English, Eastern Euro-

peans, and Dutch—more than 43 different ethnic groups—arrived in Pittsburgh, looking for a better life, attracted by jobs in the iron, steel, coal, and railroad industries. These industries formed the economic texture of America, and the University of Pittsburgh was at the heart of this industrial revolution.

In the 1920's and the early 1930's Pitt underwent one of its many building phases. During that time its most famous building, the Cathedral of Learning, the tallest university structure in the world at 42 stories, was designed and built. In order to finance and help with the construction of the cathedral, Chancellor Dr. John G. Bowman sought the help and financial assistance from Pittsburgh's various ethnic neighborhoods. As a lasting tribute Bowman established 19 nationality rooms within the cathedral dedicated to the art, religion and culture of the people and their homelands.

In 1955 Pitt and its most famous professor, Dr. Jonas E. Salk made international news. On April 12, 1955, it was announced that Salk's vaccine, developed at the university, was an effective and successful antibody in fighting poliomyelitis. From that day forward, the people were spared from the suffering, the crippled limbs, brain damage and death that the victims of polio frequently experienced. The human race was now protected from one of the most dreaded diseases known to mankind.

The Salk vaccine brought the university worldwide recognition. Pitt's success could be attributed to its commitment and determination to establish a first-class medical school and health center. It was in 1918 that the health center was envisioned by the dean of the school of medicine, Ogden Edwards, Jr.

Today, that commitment, and the continued determination to make the world a better place to live, is a fundamental cornerstone of Pitt's medical school and health center. In June 1984, Dr. Thomas Starzl, a faculty member and pioneer of transplant surgery, and Dr. Henry T. Bahnson, chairman of the department of surgery, along with other surgeons, medical specialists and nurses, performed the world's first double-transplant operation. After the 16-hour operation, during which the medical team replaced a damaged heart and liver, the staff, and their patient, 6-year-old Stormie Jones, emerged again as national heroes.

The operation procedure was such a great success that within 1 year, the health center performed the largest number of successful childhood liver transplants done anywhere in the world. Soon the demand placed on Pitt's staff became so great, Dr. Starzl began to train transplant surgeons from other cities. Today, Pitt's trans-

plant center is internationally acclaimed, and Dr. Starzl's hope for a network of transplant centers has come to fruition with approximately one dozen additional centers performing the operation around the world.

Pitt's recognition as an outstanding institution does not stop with the health center. The philosophy department ranks with the best in the world. As one of America's leading research universities, Pitt is a catalyst for economic growth and technological advancement for Pennsylvania and the Nation.

Pitt has also excelled in collegiate athletics. The Panther football team has won the national championship nine times since the program was founded in 1890. The program has produced 60 All-Americans, 1 Heisman Trophy winner, and 4 academic All-Americans. The basketball team has won two national titles, and has been invited to the NCAA tournament eight times, and the NIT tournament five times. Pitt's track & field team boasted an Olympic gold medalist in 1984, Roder Kingdom, in the 110-meter high-hurdles. Today, Lee McRae, another track team member, is the fastest human indoors, and is likely to be an Olympian in 1988.

From that tiny single-room log cabin set in the western Pennsylvania wilderness grew a world-renowned university. Within those four walls was a vision of tomorrow, and a desire to make the school and all the people whose lives it touched better. In recognition of two centuries of educational, social and economic excellence and in anticipation of a third century of providing the research and knowledge that benefit all people, I am proud to represent, and honored to congratulate, the University of Pittsburgh on its bicentennial celebration.

HAZARDOUS TO YOUR HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week I took a special order, and I will be doing so in the future, regarding the terrible epidemic that is plaguing the United States and other parts of the world called AIDS. The special order that I took last week involved a report from the Research, Testing, and Development Corp. of Lexington, GA, and the report was written by A.D.J. Robertson, who is the head of that corporation, who has almost impeccable credentials.

He took issue with some of the findings of the Surgeon General and others regarding this dread disease, and what I want to do today and in the coming weeks is read into the RECORD some articles and talk about

some of the conclusions that other health officials have come to, other scientists and doctors have come to, after studying this dread disease.

I might add for the benefit of Members who may be watching in their offices that on the 18th of March we will be having a luncheon at which Mr. Robertson and Dr. Vernon Mark of Harvard will be discussing this issue to try to clarify some of the misinformation that is traveling around this country regarding AIDS.

What I want to do today is to convey to the Members an article that was written by Dr. Wayne Lutton, who is on the staff of the Summit, Manitou Springs, CO, hospital. The article is entitled "Hazardous to Your Health." It was published January 30, 1987, in National Review. He is the coauthor, with David Noebel and Paul Cameron, of "AIDS: Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome."

Recent developments on the AIDS front are not encouraging. In late October, the New England Journal of Medicine reported that the AIDS virus can cause new types of fatal diseases by infecting patients already carrying a related virus. In November, the discovery of two new AIDS-causing viruses was revealed, both of which can escape detection by the existing AIDS blood test (New York Times, Nov. 7 and Nov. 20, 1986). And the Journal of the American Medical Association reported that, despite explicit notification that they should not donate blood, some "high-risk" AIDS carriers are still doing so.

Strictly speaking, it is no longer accurate to refer to AIDS as simply an "immune-deficiency" disease, since the viruses can attack not only immune system (T) cells, but also neural cells in the brain. As the AIDS virus mutates, it will be able to infect any cell in the body where a specific surface receptor protein is present (Cell, Nov. 7, 1986).

And while the public is being assured that an AIDS vaccine may be only 5 years away, medical researchers believe that if therapeutic drugs are developed, drug-resistant strains of AIDS viruses will emerge. Dr. David Cohn of Denver Disease Control advises that "it's basically unrealistic" to talk about a cure for AIDS: "Because of the unusual way the AIDS virus multiplies within the lymph cells, every case can potentially be a different strain."

The Surgeon General's report on AIDS was released on October 22, 1986, and immediately elicited warm praise from the New York Times, Time, and Newsweek. It was met by a chorus of approval from the advocate and other leaders of the homosexual "community." Jeff Levi, executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, gushed, "I thought it was very good. It takes a responsible and important position in favor of education . . . it is not homophobic." And Gil Gerald, director of the National Coalition of Black Lesbians and Gays, admitted that he was "very, very pleasantly surprised."

Conservatives who have applauded Dr. Koop's previous public stands on abortion, Baby Doe, and cigarette smoking are likely to experience a deep sense of dismay—indeed of betrayal—once they become familiar with his work on AIDS. The report contains a number of serious factual errors and

omissions. Koop's so-called strategy for containing AIDS—a combination of sex education for children and the use of condoms—has the potential for causing incalculable harm. Limitations of space permit the citation of only a few instances: "Although the AIDS virus has been found in tears and saliva, no instance of transmission from these body fluids has been reported" (p. 25).

Dr. Jerome Groopman of Harvard and Dr. Robert Gallo of the National Cancer Institute (and the co-discoverer of the original AIDS virus) reported in a leading British medical journal, the *Lancet* (Dec. 22/29, 1984[1]) that saliva was the mode of transmission from a man with transfusion-acquired AIDS to his wife.

This gentleman had an aneurysm, and this gentleman had a blood transfusion and he contracted AIDS during the transfusion. He and his wife had no sexual contact other than kissing, and yet she developed AIDS as well. So it was transmitted through saliva, so that factual information or supposedly factual information in the Koop report is not factual.

Dr. William Haseltine of Harvard Medical School remarked: "Anyone who tells you categorically that AIDS is not contracted by saliva is not telling you the truth" (*New York Times*, March 18, 1986).

The Koop report says:

There is no danger of AIDS-virus infection from visiting a doctor, dentist, hospital, hairdresser, or beautician . . . you may have wondered why your dentist wears gloves and perhaps a mask when treating you. This does not mean that he has AIDS or that he thinks you do. He is protecting you and himself from hepatitis, common colds, or flu (pp. 22-23).

The refutation is: "A definite danger exists of AIDS infection from any health-care provider engaging in invasive procedures. On November 15, 1985, and again on April 11, 1986, the Federal Centers for Disease Control [CDC] issued recommendations for preventing transmission of AIDS between dentists and their patients, including the wearing of gloves and masks. These recommendations have been widely adopted." So that refutes another section of the report.

Dr. Koop's report says:

Everyday living does not present any risk of infection. You cannot get AIDS from casual social contact (p. 21). "We know that family members living with individuals who have the AIDS virus do not become infected except through sexual contact." (p. 13).

Dr. Koop issued the above statement more than a month after the second documented case of nonsexual within-family transmission of AIDS was reported in the *Lancet* (Sept. 20, 1986). That was not through sexual contact.

Dr. Koop's report says:

The first cases of AIDS were reported in this country in 1981. We would know by now if AIDS were passed by casual, nonsexual contact (p. 5).

Couples who maintain mutually faithful monogamous relationships are protected from AIDS through sexual transmission. If you have been faithful for at least 5 years and your partner has been faithful, too, neither of you is at risk . . . this is true for both heterosexual and homosexual couples (p. 16).

Elsewhere in his own report, Koop concedes that "it is difficult to predict the number who will develop ARC [AIDS-related complex] or AIDS because symptoms sometimes take as long as 9 years to show up." (p. 12).

So if you are talking about 5 years as a risk-free period, that really is not borne out by the facts, because there are cases that have been showing up 9 years after contact with an AIDS victim.

Medical researchers agree that the AIDS virus appeared in the United States about 11 years ago, which is why the CDC in 1985 asked all males who had had even one homosexual encounter within the previous 10 years not to donate blood. Researchers also believe that the AIDS virus may incubate 15 years, or longer, before the onset of clinical manifestations of disease. As Washington, DC, neurologist Richard Restak cautioned, "the incubation period is sufficiently lengthy to cast doubt on any proclamations, no matter how seemingly authoritative, in regard to the transmissibility of the illness."

Dr. Koop's report states:

Some personal measures are adequate to safely protect yourself and others from infection by the AIDS virus . . . if you test positive or if you engage in high-risk activities . . . you must protect your partner by always using a rubber (condom) during (start to finish) sexual intercourse (vagina or rectum) (p. 17).

For anyone taking his advice, the consequences may be fatal. Condoms break. They fail approximately 10 percent of the time in vaginal intercourse.

During rectal intercourse, condoms may rupture up to half the time. Such devices are not even guaranteed to prevent pregnancy. By advising people that sex is safe where AIDS is present—if only they use condoms—Dr. Koop may be guilty of inducing people to engage in dangerous—perhaps lethal—behavior.

□ 1630

Whether or not Koop's utterances constitute criminal negligence, or even implicate him as an accessory to murder, is an intriguing legal question.

Dr. Koop's report went on to say:

Education of those who risk infecting themselves or infecting others is the only way we can stop the spread of AIDS (p. 14).

Education about AIDS should start in early elementary school. There is now no doubt that we need sex education in schools and that it include information on heterosexual and homosexual relations (p. 31).

We are fighting a disease, not people . . . the country must face the epidemic as a unified society. We must fight the spread of AIDS while at the same time preserving our humanity and intimacy (p. 6).

The author of this article comments on this by saying:

It is lunacy to suggest that the AIDS epidemic will be stopped by educating little children in the exotica of homosexual practices. That's on a par with combatting the drug scourge by acquainting children with all the "safe" tactics for administering narcotics to oneself.

Homosexuals, the major source of the AIDS infection, are still engaging in "unsafe" sexual practices and still attempting to make blood donations (*JAMA*, Sept. 12, 1986).

I will not go into the specifics of the sexual behavior that the article covers, but it is pretty explicit. It does go on to say that homosexuals who are well aware of the AIDS virus and the dangers are still involving themselves with an average of three new partners per month, and that is recorded in the *Lancet* of November 1, 1986. So the education has not changed their sexual habits, and this despite thousands of deaths and intensive educational efforts.

Psychologist Paul Cameron, who chairs the Institute for the Scientific Investigation of Sexuality, wonders, "Why would anyone believe that 'education only' will accomplish the task? Every study has shown homosexuals exceptionally well informed about how not to get AIDS . . . If we pursue the 'education only' option, then we have to bank on the social responsibility or self-control," which has not yet been manifested, of course.

A British expert on venereal diseases, Dr. John Seale, has called AIDS "the molecular biological equivalent of the nuclear bomb" and warns that "the genetic information contained in its tiny strip of RNA has all that is needed to render the human race extinct within 50 years." In the face of such a threat, the Reagan administration's medical specialist has issued a report that obscures the true dimensions of this disease and offers no real program for effectively dealing with it. AIDS has thus become the first politically protected disease in history. Koop's study should have emblazoned across its cover: "Warning! The Surgeon General's Report on AIDS May Be Hazardous to Your Health."

Mr. Speaker, this issue is not only a health issue, but it is also going to have all kinds of corollary ramifications. We are going to see problems with the economy and an economic impact. Society's attitudes toward one another are probably going to change, and I think it is extremely important that the legislators in this body and the other body down the hall take time out from their busy schedules to acquaint themselves with the facts on the AIDS virus, to get as much information as is humanly possible.

What I and my office are going to be doing in the coming weeks is sending reports from numerous scientists and doctors around who have studied this disease, this epidemic, to all of the offices on Capitol Hill. This is going to be a very costly undertaking, and I hope that all of my colleagues in both the House and the other body will take time to read these reports.

Then on March 18, at noon, we are going to have a luncheon with two noted scientists and researchers to discuss the AIDS virus and get into the nitty-gritty about what is causing it and what can be done to deal with this

terrible epidemic. I hope that all of my colleagues will take time out of their schedules to attend that luncheon.

Incidentally, I am going to buy.

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

RAY J. MADDEN'S 95TH BIRTHDAY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored to address the House today, as we celebrate the 95th birthday of Hon. Ray J. Madden who represented the people of Indiana's First Congressional District for 34 years.

Ray Madden is an extraordinary individual whose life should be recognized, not only for longevity, but its quality and the contributions he made to this institution and to the district he served. During his 95 years Chairman Madden has worked hard to positively influence the lives of all people regardless of their station in life. His lifetime is marked with a dedication to public service.

As a young boy, at age 8, he traveled to a rural Minnesota town with his father to hear the Democratic Presidential candidate, William Jennings Bryan.

Following his interest in politics and government, Chairman Madden embarked on the first leg of his political career at the age of 23. He was elected municipal judge of the city of Omaha, NE, 71 years ago.

During the depression, Ray Madden moved to Gary IN, where he served as city controller, a position later held by my father John Visclosky. Eventually he was elected U.S. Representative. He served as a vice chair to the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, chairman of the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and the chairman of the House Rules Committee.

I first met Chairman Madden when I visited Washington, DC, at the age of 13. As our U.S. Representative, Chairman Madden made time to take me to my first committee hearing. He joined my father and me for dinner, and posed with us for my first picture on the Capitol steps.

Today, nearly 25 years later, this wonderful gentleman continues to take time helping all those around him. He has been great assistance to

me as I proceed with my career in the House.

I know he is well remembered by our colleagues as a good and decent person.

On this special occasion of his 95th birthday, I personally extend best wishes to the chairman and wish him good health and joy in the years to come. On behalf of the constituents of the First Congressional District of Indiana, we all join to wish Ray J. Madden a happy birthday.

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

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

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time in the RECORD to commend my colleague from Indiana for taking this time to put these few remarks into the RECORD on such a Member of this body as Ray Madden was over the years. I think I can speak with some authenticity because when I came here some 19 years ago as a young Member, Congressman Madden at that time made it his business to welcome me, never ignored me as a young Member, and at that time the rules and regulations in this House were that a new Member was seen and not heard. He was very helpful in so many ways, and all of us are guilty of this, when a Member leaves, we have a tendency to forget him and forget what he stood for and what he has done.

So I think it is significant that my colleague today reminds us of a man whose longevity is almost second to none. Even when he was here he was in advanced age, but he was as bright and as sharp and as responsive as a man half his age. I think that the mark Ray Madden left on this Congress is indelible. He did so many things. He was active on the Rules Committee, if I remember, and well respected by his colleagues and a leader in so many ways.

So I think it is both appropriate and proper that my colleague, who I have grown to respect, and who serves with me on the steel caucus, has taken this time to spell out in the RECORD what this man has done.

I will conclude by saying that I know I am joined by my colleague in the well in wishing ex-Congressman Madden many more years of health and happiness.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and appreciate his remarks, and would also join in observing the fact that Ray Madden was a very good friend of not only the steel industry, but the working men and women of this country.

I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and will extend them to Mr. Madden.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Indiana delegation and my other col-

leagues of the House in extending birthday greetings and best wishes to Ray Madden.

I had the privilege of serving in the House with him early in my career. I am pleased he has remained healthy and active, and maintained an interest in Indiana politics. He served this body for decades with distinction. It is fitting that we salute him today, and join with him and the people from Indiana in celebrating this milestone of his life. I hope we will be able to do so again for many years ahead.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my distinguished good friend and former colleague, Ray J. Madden. As you know, Ray is celebrating his 95th birthday today.

As the Representative of Indiana's First Congressional District for over three decades, Chairman Madden earned the respect of both his colleagues and constituents. Ray left the House with a distinguished legislative legacy. First elected in 1942, he quickly rose to national prominence in 1952 through his chairmanship of the committee investigating the massacre of Polish army officials and intellectuals at Katyn Forest in 1939-1940. Ray soon moved up to a position as chairman of the House Rules Committee where he ably served until 1976. With over three decades in the House, Ray holds the record for length of service among Indiana Congressmen.

Despite his retirement from public service, Chairman Madden remains committed to our Nation and to the people he has served. He still keeps busy helping others and in following events here in the institution to which he has made invaluable contributions over the years. His presence is sorely missed. I hope that all of my colleagues will join me in honoring Chairman Ray Madden on his 95th birthday and in wishing him continued success and good fortune in the years to come.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to pay a tribute to Chairman Ray J. Madden in connection with his 95th birthday. He was a real leader here in Congress. When he was in the chair, you knew that things were going to happen and I, like most of the people who served with him, was grateful for his vigorous leadership. Also, I am very grateful that he is still with us, and I am sure that I am joined by every Member of Congress in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have the opportunity to recognize Hon. Ray J. Madden and his many notable achievements in this body on the auspicious occasion of his 95th birthday. Ray served with distinction in the Congress for 34 years, being returned to the House for 16 terms after the people of Indiana's First Congressional District first elected him in 1943. I find it fitting that the historic 100th Congress has been given the opportunity to salute such an accomplished lawmaker.

I had the pleasure of serving with Ray for 8 years in the House, and remember his tenure vividly. Though I was not afforded the privilege of serving with him in committee, I reflect fondly on his stewardship of the Democratic Steering Committee and his effective chairmanship of the Rules Committee. His legislative acumen and able leadership during the

challenging decades following the Second World War not only earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but cemented his place in American history.

Happy birthday, Ray. It was a pleasure serving with you, and I hope to see you back up here on the Hill as you continue an illustrious career in public service.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, an esteemed former colleague of ours, Ray J. Madden from Indiana, is celebrating his 95th birthday today. I want to join my good friend PETE VISCLOSKEY and others in this Chamber in wishing Ray the very best on this special day.

Ray, to those of you who have had the honor of meeting him, is an outstanding individual. He has been a delegate to every Indiana State convention since 1936, and a delegate to every Democratic National Convention from 1940 to 1968.

He was elected to the First Congressional District seat from Indiana for the 78th Congress in 1942, and was reelected to every succeeding Congress through the 94th Congress, which ended in 1977. He holds the record for length of service among Indiana Members of Congress.

When Ray was beginning his 11th term, I was beginning my first. Ray's guidance and friendship were invaluable as I learned the ropes of the House of Representatives.

Ray remains as committed to his constituents and to Congress today as he was when he was a Member. As the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, Ray could always be counted on for worthy advice and a sympathetic ear to any concerns other Members would have.

In addition to his years as chairman of the Rules Committee, Ray was very active in party politics. He was the first vice chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, cochairman of the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress, and chairman of the Democratic Steering Committee.

Ray began his political career at an early age, running for city judge in Omaha, NE, at age 23. He ran on Woodrow Wilson's ticket, but resigned in 1916 to join the Army. Ray moved to Indiana during the Depression, and was elected Democratic city chairman of Gary after only 2 years' residence.

When Ray was a spry 90 years old, he told a Capitol Hill reporter, "I'm happy and I'm in good health and I'm 90 years old. I'm without an ache or pain, without worry, and I'm enjoying life." Ray, 5 years later, I hope nothing has changed.

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

□ 1640

H.R. 1102: AN AMENDMENT TO THE STEEL IMPORT STABILIZATION ACT OF 1984

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, American steel workers and producers need our help to escape strangulation at the hands of foreign importers. The slow, painful erosion of the U.S. steel industry has been occurring for the past 20 years, and it is now reaching crisis proportions. In the past 10 years, total U.S. raw steel production has decreased from 128 million tons in 1976 to an estimated 80.5 million tons in 1986. This represents a whopping 59-percent decrease in the past 10 years and the 80.5 million tons is the second lowest annual total since 1946! (40 years!!) Clearly, the domestic steel industry is ailing and we need to see what we can do to cure it.

During this decade-long decline in American raw steel production our percentage of steel imports has sharply risen. In 1976, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, our Nation imported 14.3 million tons of steel products or 14.1 percent of the American domestic steel market. The annual imports for 1986 were about 21 million tons or about 23.5 percent of the domestic market. Thus, during the last 10 years we lost 9 percent of our domestic steel market due to the increasing competition from foreign steel importers!

America's increasing trade deficit is the most important legislative issue the 100th Congress will face. We have trade imbalances in steel, textiles, electronics, and many other trade commodities. As Members of this Congress we continue to have the responsibility to address the problem of the trade imbalance caused by foreign imports which continue flooding the American marketplace. We must work to ensure that more workers do not lose their jobs and that our Nation's businesses are not subject to increased unfair foreign competition. Congress' role as the guardian and regulator of trade was established by our forefathers exactly 200 years ago.

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States specifically grants Congress the power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations * * *." We must use this authority to bring strength back onto American manufacturing industries and to help restore our balance of trade. In our present import crisis we must move wisely and resolutely toward measures which restore a competitive balance to American commerce in general and to the steel industry specifically.

The Steel Import Stabilization Act of 1984, title VIII of the Omnibus Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, was

drafted to lower the amount of foreign steel entering the American market to 20.5 percent. It was adopted in 1984 because our domestic steel market was flooded with more foreign steel than ever before in American history. In 1984 foreign-made steel made up a striking 26.4 percent of all of the steel purchased by American steel consumers. This percentage of market penetration was completely unacceptable and Congress voted to lower it.

The Steel Import Stabilization Act required the President to negotiate a series of voluntary restraint agreements [VRA's] with 18 of the countries who sell foreign steel in the United States. The magic upper limit for total imports was to be a 20.2-percent share of our total domestic steel market. However, during the first 11 months of last year, 23.1 percent of the America's steel appetite was satisfied by foreign steel producers.

The almost 3-percent gap between the legislative limit and the real amount has not been caused by countries who signed voluntary restraint agreements. The VRA countries have abided by their agreements, and, in fact, have exported less than their negotiated share. The problem rests with those countries that have refused to negotiate agreements, but continue to export steel to the United States.

The non-VRA nation which sends the most steel to the United States is Canada. During 1986, according to the Congressional Research Service and the American Iron and Steel Institute, Canada shipped 3.22 million net tons of steel mill products into our country, a 12.2-percent increase over the comparable period in the preceding year. Last year, Canada also imported 216,141 tons of American steel or 23.2 percent of the 929,156 tons of steel our Nation exported. So, our steel trade deficit with Canada was 3 million tons of steel or 1,281 percent!

Thanks to their Government-sponsored steel plant modernization program, in 1986 Sweden was the second biggest non-VRA exporter with 534,000 tons and we sent them a skimpy 3,547 tons of our steel. These numbers show a trade deficit of 530,543 tons or 15,054 percent!

Taiwan was the third-largest non-VRA exporter last year when they shipped 126,500 tons of raw steel into the United States and we sold them 51,060 tons. This Taiwanese steel trade deficit of 75,440 tons, or 40.3 percent, is certainly better than our Swedish steel deficit, but it is still very, very high. Together, these three non-VRA countries shipped 4.26 million tons of steel into the United States, or 20.5 percent of all of the foreign steel which poured into the American steel market last year.

Let me say that again, 20.5 percent of all of last year's imported steel

came from just three nations, and not one of these three is covered by the administration's voluntary restraint agreement! Clearly, there is some problem with our steel policy if a large percentage of our steel imports come from countries that we hardly bother to regulate. Our failure to control this overwhelming deluge of imports from unregulated countries has deeply injured the American steel industry.

In order to improve our steel industry, 18 of my colleagues and I have introduced H.R. 1102, a bill to correct the Steel Import Stabilization Act of 1984. H.R. 1102 will limit all steel imports from Canada, Sweden, and Taiwan unless those countries sign a steel voluntary restraint agreement. The bill also addresses and corrects the ongoing problem of circumvention of the steel VRA Program.

H.R. 1102 requires that all steel entering the United States from non-VRA countries be allocated to the country where the steel was melted and poured, regardless of where the final finishing is performed.

The bill mandates that Canada, Sweden, and Taiwan negotiate a VRA within 90 days of its enactment or else their steel exports will be limited to 70 percent of the level of their exports during the 12 months preceding the implementation of the VRA program. This extension of the VRA program would stimulate the American steel market and the shrinking steel job market.

Employment is one aspect of the steel industry that has been hit hard by the recent massive steel imports. In 1986 there were about 157,000 people employed by the steel industry. This is down from 391,000 just 5 years ago, and it pales by comparison with the 454,000 people engaged in the business just 10 short years ago. In statistical terms, this 10-year loss of 297,000 jobs represents a 289.2 percent drop in the number of people engaged in making steel. In human terms, it represents the pain and misery of hundreds of thousands of people who have lost jobs that they have held for years. Words can hardly describe the suffering and frustration that these hard-working steelworkers feel. They have lost their livelihoods, their confidence, and their future security.

Steelworkers are uncertain about what the future holds for them and they are looking to Congress and the President to give their lives more stability. We cannot offer them simplistic arguments about a company's "right to fail" because these arguments are not applicable to the steel industry. Our Nation's ability to produce steel and steel products is the foundation of the manufacturing sector of all of America's industry.

Reduced steel production in the United States affects not only the steel industry, but other related busi-

nesses and industries as well. Steel companies use the services of banks, computer companies, lawyers, accountants, shipping and trucking companies, stock brokers, financial consultants, insurance companies, and myriad other industries and services. If we allow the steel industry to gradually rust away, the recessive impact will be far-reaching and we will have to resign ourselves to both a higher trade deficit and higher unemployment.

This grim forecast does not have to become a reality. As Members of Congress we have the ability to expand the voluntary restraint agreement umbrella to cover all of the nations who import the most steel into the United States. H.R. 1102 will help further revitalize America's domestic steel industry by helping it become even more competitive and efficient. As legislators, we need to assume our constitutionally mandated responsibility to regulate trade in the best interests of our Nation. At the moment the industry most in need is steel manufacturing.

Our steelmaking capacity is vital to American business, trade, transportation, and to our Nation's defense. Unless we do something about it, this capacity will soon disappear. The President's voluntary restraint agreements appear to be an effective way to regulate the overwhelming volume of steel imports and to bring foreign steel exporters to the bargaining table.

Non-VRA countries must not be allowed to exploit or undermine the steel program by taking advantage of the restraints negotiated in good faith with other nations. All of the nations who export steel into the United States must be included in the VRA program. Our bill brings these nations into the VRA program, and I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor and strongly support it.

□ 1650

COMMITTEE IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing House Resolution 100, the Committee Improvement Amendments of 1987. This package of eight amendments to the rules of the House is designed to restore our committee system to its rightful policymaking role by making it more manageable, accountable, and effective.

Mr. Speaker, I have been introducing similar committee reform resolutions since the 97th Congress in 1981, and many of these proposals have been part of Republican House reform efforts dating back more than two decades. Thus, while many of our criticisms of committee operations and suggested reforms are not new, they are probably more timely

now than ever, given the accelerating deterioration of our committee system.

On the opening day of this historic 100th Congress, the Republican conference put forward its "Bicentennial House Restoration Project" as a substitute for the Democratic Caucus House rules resolution. The committee improvement amendments I am introducing today comprise one of three vital components of that project, the other two being scheduling and budget/appropriations reforms.

I have already introduced the other components as follows: House Scheduling Reform Amendments (H. Res. 47, Jan. 21, 1987, p. 1808); Budget Process Sunset Review Act (H.R. 576, Jan. 8, 1987, p. 1085); Reconciliation Reform Amendments (H. Res. 49, Jan. 21, 1987, p. 1814); and the Appropriations Process Reform Amendments (H. Res. 48, Jan. 21, 1987, p. 1796).

COMMITTEE DECLINE

The committee reform amendments recognize that if we are to restore the ability of this House to forge policy and consensus in a deliberative and rational fashion, we must revitalize our standing committees which should be at the center of that policy process. To quote from the introduction to the Republican conference's Bicentennial House Restoration Project:

The authorizing committees, which should comprise the heart of that process, are rapidly approaching irrelevance—squeezed-out by the budget and appropriations processes, and caught-up in jurisdictional infighting and subcommittee strangulation.

And the introduction goes on:

Oversight of Federal agencies and programs and the policy changes which should flow from such oversight are either relegated to the backburners at the committee level or, if they are reported to the House are often given inadequate time for debate and the consideration of options under procedures which increasingly limit the participation of individual Members of Congress.

And finally, the Republican conference critique notes that this authorization squeezeout is resulting in increasing numbers of authorizations and legislative provisions being tacked onto reconciliation and appropriations bills:

Reconciliation bills, designed to reduce deficits, are choked-full of spending additions and other extraneous matters. Appropriations bills, which are only supposed to fund programs already enacted, are increasingly being used as authorization vehicles as well.

The critique concludes on this point:

Hundreds of programs and projects are renewed from year-to-year in such money bills without prior authorization. And, as a new fiscal year approaches, they are rolled into a massive, omnibus money bill known as a "continuing resolution" that is a monument to the irresolution of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to resolve to either make our standing committees work as intended or to junk them as some have suggested and merge the authorizing and appropriations functions into single committees. I would prefer that we try to make our existing system work rather than adopt the more radi-

cal approach, and that is the purpose of my committee improvement amendments.

DIMINISHING RETURNS

Mr. Speaker, the demise of our authorizing committees can be linked in large part to the congressional reform revolution of the late sixties and early seventies that open up the Congress to greater public scrutiny, democratized committee operations, and superimposed a new budget process on our existing authorization-appropriations process. Many of those reforms were commendable and long overdue, and have made the House a more open and freewheeling institution.

On the other hand, some of the reforms, particularly those imposed on committees by the Democratic Caucus in the form of a "subcommittee bill of rights," went too far. In their zeal to break the tight hold of committee chairmen, the so-called barons, over the legislative process, the Democratic Caucus established a sprawling system of semiautonomous subcommittees, or "fiefdoms." The idea was to give everybody a piece of the action. The trouble with this approach is that when everyone has a share of power, power becomes so dispersed that it loses all force, direction, purpose, and accountability. We have reached that point to diminishing returns on our reform excesses.

As table 1 below shows, while the number of standing committees has remained relatively constant over the last 20 years, at between 20 and 22, the number of subcommittees has increased dramatically: from 125 in the 89th Congress (1965-66), to 149 in the 94th Congress (1975-76), to 151 in the 99th Congress (1985-86)—a 21-percent increase in subcommittees.

One might think that this proliferation of new legislative units might be in response to increased legislative demands on Congress. But the data contained in table 1 do not support that hypothesis. Whereas committees reported 1,613 bills in the 89th Congress, they reported only 985 in the 94th Congress, and 633 in the 99th Congress—a 60-percent decline in two decades.

By the same token, the number of public bills and joint resolutions passed by the House had dropped from 1,565 in the 89th Congress to 973 in the 99th Congress—a 38-percent decrease. And the number of substantive measures enacted, when one deletes the commemorative joint resolutions, which have jumped from 3.2 percent of all laws in 1965-66 to 37.2 percent in 1985-86, has declined from 784 to 417—a 47-percent drop.

TABLE 1.—COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE DATA FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: 89TH, 94TH, AND 99TH CONGRESSES

Item	89th Cong. (1965- 66)	94th Cong. (1975- 76)	99th Cong. (1985- 86)
Days in session	336	311	281
Hours in session	1,545	1,788	1,794
Public measures introduced *	19,874	16,982	6,499
Public measures reported	1,613	985	633
Public measures passed	1,565	968	973
Public measures enacted	810	588	664
Average pages per statute *	3.6	7.0	NA
(Commemorative measures enacted)	(26)	(16)	(247)
Substantive public laws *	784	572	417
House standing committees	20	22	22
Select committees	1	6	5
Subcommittees *	125	149	151
House committee staff *	616	1,734	2,051

* Bills and joint resolutions only; does not include simple or concurrent resolutions.

* Prior to 1967, Members could not cosponsor bills; in April of 1967 up to 25 cosponsors were permitted on a bill; and, in 1973, unlimited cosponsors were permitted on any bill.

* From U.S. Statutes at Large.

* Public laws minus commemorative.

* Includes subcommittees of permanent select committees on Aging and Intelligence, 8 Budget Committee task forces and 4 Armed Services panels.

* Includes all House standing and select committee staff plus the House Information Systems.

Sources: Final "Resume of Congressional Activity" from Daily Digest of Congressional Records; "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload and Activity" (CRS, June 25, 1985); Committee on House Administration Reports; Congressional Directory.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous explanations for this marked decline in legislative activity, not the least of which is a most welcome pulling back in new Government initiatives and spending since the Great Society days of the midsixties. Certainly, we should not measure the success of this body by the number of laws we enact or the amount of taxpayer dollars we can manage to spend in a year on diverse programs and projects.

Another explanation lies in the practice of referring bills to two or more committees which was instituted in 1975. Prior to that, no bill could be referred to more than one committee. Now, more and more committees are spending their time going over legislation being considered by other committees. To an extent this could be considered useful because it may give the House competing perspectives on a particular issue. But, to an extent it can also be considered wasteful and duplicative.

Finally, another explanation for the apparent decline in legislative activity is the trend toward bigger, more comprehensive bills than was previously the case—the so-called omnibus bills. Whereas in the 89th Congress the average number of pages per statute in the U.S. Statutes at Large was 3.6, in the 94th Congress it was 7, and in the 97th Congress—the most recently available data—it was 9.2. So, while we are passing and enacting roughly 40 percent fewer bills in the House today than we did 20 years ago, the bills we are enacting are 175 percent longer, on average, than they were two decades ago.

NEW, CLEAR PROLIFERATION LIMITS

Nevertheless, one must question the proliferation of subcommittees and staff, and with it the increase in Member committee and subcommittee assignments that have resulted. It is doubtful that this subcommittee growth bears much correlation to increased legislative demands, let alone to sound institutional management and coordination. It is more likely that this explosion is due to the individual territorial imperatives than it is to the institutional imperatives for efficiency and success.

In the 99th Congress, for instance, no fewer than 132 of the 253 House Democrats, that's 52 percent, carry the proud title of "Mr. Chairman" by virtue of their dominion over a committee, subcommittee, or select committee. And in this Congress, the percentage is likely to be even higher given a new Democratic Caucus rule which prohibits committee chairmen from chairing a subcommittee on another committee. When more than half of majority party members are banging gavels, you can be sure that you're more likely to get the sound of legislative cacophony than you are to get sound legislation.

At the heart of the committee improvement resolution I am introducing today is a proposal

to limit all committees, except Appropriations, to no more than six subcommittees. As table 2 below shows, there were 151 House subcommittees in the 99th Congress. My proposal would reduce this by 19 to 132 subcommittees—a 13-percent reduction in subcommittees.

TABLE 2.—SUBCOMMITTEES OF HOUSE COMMITTEES IN THE 99TH CONGRESS

Committee	Number of subcommittees *	Reduction with 6-limit	New total
Agriculture	8	-2	6
Appropriations *	13	0	13
Armed Services	11	-5	6
Banking, Finance	8	-2	6
Budget	8	-2	6
District of Columbia	3	0	3
Education and Labor	8	-2	6
Energy and Commerce	6	0	6
Foreign Affairs	8	-2	6
Government Operations	7	-1	6
House Administration	6	0	6
Interior	6	0	6
Judiciary	7	-1	6
Merchant Marine	6	0	6
Post Office	7	-1	6
Public Works	6	0	6
Rules	2	0	2
Science and Technology	7	-1	6
Small Business	6	0	6
Standards	0	0	0
Veterans Affairs	5	0	5
Ways and Means	6	0	6
Aging	4	0	4
Intelligence	3	0	2
Total	151	-19	132

Source: U.S. House of Representatives Telephone Directory (1986).

* Includes 8 Budget Task Forces and 4 Armed Services Panels appointed for entire Congress.

* Appropriations would not be required to reduce subcommittees.

Closely tied to this proposal is the requirement that Members be limited to no more than four subcommittee assignments. Any panel, task force, or other subunit in existence for more than 6 months, and any select committee assignment, would count toward this overall limit.

Mr. Speaker, while Members may enjoy the honor of multiple committee and subcommittee assignments, the fact is that they are now spread too thinly to do a conscientious job on all the units to which they are assigned. While subcommittees increased in number by 21 percent over the last two decades, the number of House Members remained constant at 435.

Table 3 below shows the growth in the number of committee, subcommittee, select, and joint committee seats over the years, dating back to the 79th Congress in 1945-46, and with it the corresponding growth in Member assignments. As a result of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which significantly reduced the number of House committees, the mean number of Member assignments dropped from 4.15 in the 79th Congress to 2.94 in the 80th Congress. But then, it gradually began to grow to 4.71 by the 89th Congress in 1965-66, to 6.15 in the 94th Congress (1975-76), and to 6.45 in the 99th Congress (1985-86). My proposal would most likely bring that down to a maximum of 6 committee, subcommittee, and select committee assignments total—a significant reduction for many Members who now hold up to 10 or more such seats.

TABLE 3.—COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS IN HOUSE: 79TH–99TH CONGRESSES¹

Congress	Total number of assignments ²				Mean number of standing committee assignments	Mean number of subcommittee assignments	Mean number of select, special and joint assignments	Total mean number of committee assignments
	Standing committees	Subcommittees of standing committees	Select, special and joint committees	Total				
79 (1945–46)	941	752	113	1,806	2.16	1.73	0.26	4.15
80 (1947–48)	482	742	56	1,280	1.11	1.71	.13	2.94
81 (1949–50)	481	533	66	1,080	1.11	1.23	.15	2.48
82 (1951–52)	491	611	78	1,180	1.13	1.41	.18	2.71
83 (1953–54)	526	670	66	1,262	1.21	1.54	.15	2.90
84 (1955–56)	542	765	116	1,423	1.25	1.76	.27	3.27
85 (1957–58)	549	975	145	1,669	1.26	2.24	.33	3.84
86 (1959–60)	575	1,095	144	1,814	1.32	2.51	.33	4.15
87 (1961–62)	584	1,128	161	1,873	1.34	2.58	.37	4.29
88 (1963–64)	594	1,211	137	1,942	1.37	2.78	.32	4.46
89 (1965–66)	602	1,274	171	2,047	1.38	2.93	.39	4.71
90 (1967–68)	613	1,378	187	2,178	1.41	3.17	.43	5.01
91 (1969–70)	637	1,403	186	2,226	1.46	3.23	.43	5.12
92 (1971–72)	674	1,450	216	2,340	1.54	3.32	.49	5.36
93 (1973–74)	710	1,531	261	2,502	1.62	3.49	.60	5.70
94 (1975–76)	770	1,719	210	2,699	1.75	3.92	.48	6.15
95 (1977–78)	776	1,716	259	2,751	1.77	3.91	.59	6.27
96 (1979–80)	764	1,692	242	2,698	1.74	3.85	.55	6.15
97 (1981–82)	757	1,564	235	2,556	1.72	3.56	.53	5.81
98 (1983–84)	765	1,710	277	2,752	1.74	3.89	.63	6.26
99 (1985–86)	781	1,734	323	2,838	1.77	3.94	.74	6.45

¹ Sources: Data for the 79th Congress are compiled from U.S. Congress, Joint Committees on the Organization of Congress, Hearings, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., March 13–June 29, 1945, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1945, p. 1084; data for the 80th through 83d Congresses are compiled from U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Standing Committee Structure and Assignments: House and Senate, Report No. 82-42 GOV, by Sula P. Richardson and Susan Schjelderup, Washington, 1982, p. 77; and data for the 84th through the 98th Congresses are compiled from information taken from yearly volumes of Brownson, "Congressional Staff Directory," Congressional Quarterly, "Congressional Quarterly Almanac," and "CQ Weekly Report," and West Publishing Co., "U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News."

² These figures include statutory members of the chamber who participate in committee and subcommittee activities. As of the 99th Congress, this group includes four Delegates and one Resident Commissioner.

Note.—This table is reprinted from: "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload and Activity," by Roger H. Davidson, Congressional Research Service, June 25, 1985.

STAFF INFECTION

With the proliferation of subcommittees has come an even more radical increase in committee staff. As table 1 shows, committee staff has increased from 616 in the 89th Congress, to 1,734 in the 94th Congress, to 2,051 in the 99th Congress—a shocking 233-percent increase over two decades. That far overshadows the 21-percent increase in the number of subcommittees.

It is probably true that our committees were understaffed 20 years ago, and that more staff was needed if we were to hold our own as a coequal branch with the burgeoning executive bureaucracy. But, like the other reforms of that era, we went to such extremes that we have reached that point of diminishing returns. We are now suffering from a staff infection.

As Michael J. Malbin writes in his book, "Unelected Representatives":

... Congress has reacted to the governmental complexity it has created by building up its staffs defensively to preserve an important role for itself. But the size of those staffs and the way they are used has reinforced a situation in which the deliberative aspect of representation gets short shrift on all but the broad outlines of a few issues.

And Malbin continues:

The weakening of deliberation is serious for a Congress that works best when it responds to constituents' needs and interests in a setting that encourages the members to think more broadly. The process no longer forces members to talk to each other to resolve the tough issues; the agenda keeps them busy with other things.

He concludes that,

If Congress is to play its crucial representative role ... (in) coming decades, it must find some way to limit its agenda and reinforce the role of direct deliberation.

I would agree that our system of representative democracy through a deliberative legislative process is threatened to the extent that we overwhelm ourselves with staff and delegate to them the responsibilities which should

be ours. Certainly we need staff and cannot possibly do everything ourselves. But we must ask ourselves at this point whether we and the country are really being served well and responsibly when we are overly dependent on staff and cannot possibly manage or absorb all that is being done for us and in our names by staff.

As table 4 below shows, House standing and select committees have a total of 1,848 staff, not counting HIS which was included under table 1. While the average ratio of staff to committee members is two per Member, some committees are significantly above this.

TABLE 4.—STAFF TO MEMBER RATIOS ON HOUSE COMMITTEES, 99TH CONGRESS

Committee	Staff	Members	Staff/member ratio
Agriculture	65	43	1.5
Appropriations	198	57	3.5
Armed Services	59	46	1.3
Banking, Finance	94	47	2.0
Budget	109	33	3.3
District of Columbia	42	11	3.8
Education and Labor	116	32	3.6
Energy and Commerce	140	42	3.3
Foreign Affairs	93	42	2.2
Government Operations	78	39	2.0
House Administration	53	19	2.8
Interior	70	35	2.0
Judiciary	78	35	2.2
Merchant Marine	72	42	1.7
Post Office	85	21	4.0
Public Works	81	46	1.8
Rules	49	13	3.8
Science and Technology	73	41	1.8
Small Business	54	42	1.3
Standards	12	10	1.2
Veterans	31	34	.9
Ways and Means	92	36	2.6
Aging	38	65	.6
Children	19	25	.8
Hunger	15	17	.9
Intelligence	18	16	1.1
Narcotics	14	25	.6
Total	1,848	914	2.0

¹ Average.

Source: Clerk's Report and House Administration Report, July 1986.

With the 13-percent reduction in subcommittees, it should be possible to begin to pare down the number of committee staff and bring us within more reasonable and workable num-

bers. Section 9 of the committee improvement amendments calls for an overall staff ceiling in this Congress of not more than 90 percent of the number of committee staff employed at the end of the last Congress. This provision would result in a reduction of 185 committee staff and bring the total down from 1,848 to 1,663.

This 10-percent reduction would not be across the board for all committees. Instead, it would be implemented in connection with a process established in the resolution whereby the House would adopt a committee staff ceiling at the beginning of each Congress. The House Administration Committee would recommend this ceiling after taking into account the past and anticipated legislative and oversight workload of each committee.

Finally, the resolution would entitle the minority party on each committee, on request, to up to one-third of the investigative staff funds, just as the minority is now entitled to one-third of statutory staff.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is fortunate to have a large number of very dedicated, professional committee staff, and my proposals are in no way offered in criticism of the work they have done for us and the country. But I do think the time has come for us to reassert our own roles and bring the activities of this body back within our manageable grasp. Only by so doing can we ensure our continued representative character.

PHANTOM DEVICES

With the reduction in subcommittees and Member assignments we can eliminate those so-called phantom legislative devices which have been justified and necessitated by the inability of Members to be at several meetings and hearings simultaneously. My proposal would eliminate all proxy voting in committee and would restore the requirement that a majority of members must be present to take any action.

Under existing House rules, each committee may adopt rules permitting votes to be cast by proxy, and all but four of our standing commit-

tees permit proxy voting. Moreover, House rules permit each committee except Appropriations, Budget, and Ways and Means to establish a quorum of one-third of the members for taking any action other than reporting a matter, which still requires a majority quorum; 14 of our 22 standing committees have such one-third quorum rules.

I think it goes without saying that these absentee voting and antiquorum devices do not make for either a representative or deliberative legislative process at the subcommittee and committee levels where legislation takes its basic shape. To the extent that bills reflect the will only of the committee or subcommittee chairmen, and their pocketfull of paper proxy loyalists, they are unlikely to be acceptable when they reach the next level of the process.

If we are truly interested in restoring our authorizing committees to a serious policymaking role, we must first get members back in their committee rooms to do the hard work necessary. With fewer subcommittees and assignments, and a ban on phantom legislating, this would be possible.

RATIO DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Speaker, one of the longstanding disputes between the parties in the House has been the allocation of committee seats. While every other parliamentary democracy establishes committee with party ratios that reflect the ratios in the legislative body as a whole, the Democrats in the U.S. House have long practiced ratio discrimination, giving their party members a disproportionate number of committee seats.

Not only is this an outrage in terms of the one-man, one-vote concept, but it effectively disenfranchises a half million Americans for every committee seat the minority is denied. Moreover, just as proxy voting and one-third quorums tend to encourage absenteeism and thus result in unrepresentative legislation, the denial of equitable party representation only exacerbates this situation. Taken together, these devices only increase the prospect that legislation reported to the House will not be acceptable to the House as a whole and will thus require substantial rewriting in the form of amendments.

How does the majority party manage to disenfranchise minority Members at the committee level? Quite simply, ratios are dictated by Democratic Caucus rules. Party ratios on committees are not even subject to a House vote, even though the Constitution requires that each House determine its own rules. The caucus rules in the 99th Congress contained the following requirements:

Committee ratios should be established to create firm working majorities on each committee. In determining the ratio on the respective standing committees, the Speaker should provide for a minimum of three Democrats for each two Republicans.

Thus, while Democrats comprised only 58 percent of all House Members in the 99th Congress, they were guaranteed at least 60 percent of the seats on all House committees under the Caucus rule requirement. As table 5 shows below, this stacking of committees by just 2 percent over the House ratio added up to a loss of 17 seats which should have gone to the Republicans. Put another way, assum-

ing each congressional district contains at least a half a million people, the Democratic Caucus effectively disenfranchised 8½ million American citizens at the committee level where legislation takes its critical shape.

TABLE 5.—PARTY RATIOS ON HOUSE COMMITTEES IN THE 99TH CONGRESS

Committee	Seats	Democrat/Republican	Percent Democrat/Republican	Percent Democrat deviation	Excess Democrat seats
Agriculture	43	26/17	60/40	+2	+1
Appropriations	57	35/22	61/39	+3	+2
Armed Services	46	27/19	59/41	+1	0
Banking	47	28/19	60/40	+2	+1
Budget	33	20/13	61/39	+3	+1
District of Columbia	11	7/4	64/36	+6	+1
Education and Labor	32	19/13	59/41	+1	0
Energy and Commerce	42	25/17	60/40	+2	+1
Foreign Affairs	42	25/17	60/40	+2	+1
Government Operations	39	23/16	59/41	+1	0
House Administration	19	12/7	63/37	+5	+1
Interior	35	22/13	63/37	+5	+2
Judiciary	35	21/14	60/40	+2	+1
Merchant Marine	42	25/17	60/40	+2	+1
Post Office	21	13/8	62/38	+4	+1
Public Works	46	27/19	59/41	+1	0
Rules	13	9/4	69/31	+11	+1
Science and Technology	41	24/17	58/42	0	0
Standards	12	6/6	50/50	-8	-1
Small Business	42	25/17	60/40	+2	+1
Veterans	34	20/14	59/41	+1	0
Ways and Means	36	23/13	64/36	+6	+2
Total committee seats	768	462/306	60/40	+2	+17
Total House seats	435	253/182	58/42	NA	NA

Under section 4 of my committee improvement amendments, the party ratio on all standing, select, joint, and conference committees would be required to reflect the party ratio of the House at the time of the committees' appointment. I think this is an important step in restoring our standing committees to an effective policymaking role since it will help ensure that they are more representative and accountable to the House and to the American people.

MULTIPLE MADNESS

As I mentioned earlier, one of the reasons our committees have been less productive than in the past has been the institution of multiple bill referral back in 1975. Prior to that, no bill could be referred to more than one committee. Now bills can be referred to any number of committees having even remote jurisdictional claims on a small provision in a bill, either jointly, sequentially, or in a split fashion.

While the referral of bills to multiple committees can afford the House a variety of perspective on particular issues and problems, it can also result in a lot of duplication of effort, jurisdictional fighting, and delays. A House select committee in the 95th Congress, just 3 years after the initiation of the multiple-referral practice, found that such referrals consumed four times as much hearing and meeting and hearing time, yet had half the chance as singly referred bills of ever being reported from committee, and more than three times less chance of ever being passed by the House.

A more recent study by the Congressional Research Service indicates that things aren't quite as bad as they once were, but that multiple referrals still cause considerable problems and delays for the institution.

As table 6 shows below, in the last three Congresses roughly 11 percent of all intro-

duced bills are multiply referred; they comprise roughly 12 percent of all bills reported from committee, yet only about 6 percent of all bills passed by the House. Singly referred bills have twice as much chance of being passed by the House, partly because more singly referred bills are passed without being reported than multiply referred measures. In the last Congress, there was a marked improvement in the number of multiply reported bills passed—up from 51 and 58 percent in the 97th and 98th Congresses to 71 percent in the 99th Congress.

TABLE 6.—DISPOSITION OF SINGLY AND MULTIPLY REFERRED MEASURES: 96TH–98TH CONGRESSES

	96th Cong. No. (%)	97th Cong. No. (%)	98th Cong. No. (%)
Referred:			
Singly	9,319 (88)	8,496 (90)	7,486 (89)
Multiply	1,241 (12)	905 (10)	965 (11)
Total	10,560 (100)	9,401 (100)	8,451 (100)
Reported:			
Singly	1,139 (89)	699 (87)	847 (86)
Multiply	147 (11)	106 (13)	136 (14)
Total	1,286 (100)	805 (100)	983 (100)
Passed:			
Singly	1,403 (95)	997 (94)	1,279 (93)
Multiply	75 (5)	61 (6)	96 (7)
Total	1,478	1,058	1,375
Reported as percent of referred:			
Singly	12.2	8.2	11.3
Multiply	11.8	11.7	14.0
Total	12.2	8.6	11.6
Passed as percent of referred:			
Singly	15.1	11.7	17.1
Multiply	6.0	6.7	9.9
Total	14.0	11.3	16.3
Passed as percent of reported:			
Singly	123	143	151
Multiply	51	58	71
Total	115	131	140

¹ The number of bills passed as a percent of those reported is greater than 100 percent in the case of singly reported measures and total measures since many bills, which have not been reported from committee, are considered and passed in the House under such procedures as unanimous consent and suspension of the rules.

Source: Derived from data in "The Incidence and Impact of Multiple Referrals in the House of Representatives" (CRS, July, 1986).

Section 3 of my resolution would abolish the joint referral of bills while retaining split and sequential referrals. The purpose of this is to avoid having two or more committees going over exactly the same ground while still preserving the ability of committees with legitimate jurisdictional concerns to participate in amending and reporting on those matters of direct concern.

At the same time, my rule requires that, whenever any bill does receive a split or sequential referral, the Speaker shall designate one committee as the committee of principal jurisdiction. The Speaker has been doing this on an increasing basis in recent times, but in a purely discretionary and selective manner. There is no reason why this form of accountability should not be made uniform for every bill which is multiply referred.

Table 7 below shows that by far the greatest number of multiply referred bills in the 98th Congress were joint referrals, some 96 percent. Of the joint referrals that were reported, roughly 67 percent passed. Of the se-

quentially referred bills reported, approximately 76 percent passed. This is due in part to the fact that many bills are not sequentially referred until after one committee has already reported. This practice would increase under my proposal, with strict time limits for reporting from committees receiving a sequential referral, as is now often done.

TABLE 7.—REPORT AND PASSAGE OF MULTIPLE REFERRAL TYPES BY NUMBERS OF COMMITTEES, 98TH CONGRESS (1983–84)

Numbers of committees of referral	Joint			Reported as percent of referred	Passed as percent of referred
	Referred	Reported	Passed		
2 committees.....	784	86	63	11.0	8.0
3 committees.....	90	11	2	12.2	2.2
4 or more committees.....	52	2	2	3.8	3.8
Total.....	926	99	67	10.7	7.2
Sequential					
2 committees.....	25	25	18	100.0	72.0
3 committees.....	8	8	8	100.0	100.0
4 or more committees.....	5	5	3	100.0	60.0
Total.....	38	38	29	100.0	76.3

Note.—The only split referral of the 98th Congress, the Enterprise Zone Act of 1983, was not reported by any of the three committees of referral and was not considered on the floor.

Source: Reprinted from "The Incidence and Impact of Multiple Referrals in the House of Representatives," by Oleszek, Davidson and Kephart, Congressional Research Service, July 1986.

OVERSIGHT OVERLOOKED

Mr. Speaker, essential to restoring the policy role of committees is a much more serious and active oversight effort. In recent years, oversight responsibilities have been largely overlooked by committees in their preoccupation with legislative turf and budgetary battles. And yet, unless committees do a better job of looking into the performance of existing executive agencies and programs, it is doubtful they can shape more rational and workable policies for the future.

Except for the occasional scandal and sensational investigation that accompanies it, committees are reluctant to undertake oversight because it is often unexciting, unglamorous, and unrewarding. Contrary to being politically rewarding, oversight is often viewed as being laden with political negatives since certain special interests do not take kindly to having the programs that benefit them examined closely. To them, oversight poses a threat to maintaining the status quo.

One would have thought that in this era of budgetary constraint, Congress would be taking its oversight responsibilities more seriously as we search for ways to reduce spending. And yet, there is no overwhelming evidence that this is the case. Instead, committees squirm and scream whenever their reconciliation directives force them to come up with spending cuts. They usually seem ill-prepared to make the rational policy choices necessary to conform to budgetary realities and mandates.

Under House rule X, clause 2, all standing committees "shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness," of those laws under their jurisdiction, to determine whether the laws and programs are being carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress and

"whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated."

Ironically, at the beginning of this Congress the Democratic Caucus took a backward step on oversight by abolishing another part of that House rule which required that committees submit oversight agendas to the Government Operations Committee at the beginning of each Congress for combined publication. The requirement was deleted on grounds that oversight plans would still be required by the House Administration Committee in considering committee funding resolutions. And yet, it is doubtful the House Administration Committee can require any meaningful agendas without the sanction of House rules.

Under section 2 of my resolution, not only would the oversight agenda requirement be restored, but it would be strengthened by requiring that each committee formally approve such agendas and be held accountable for them at the end of each Congress. This is the way we should be heading rather than retrenching on our oversight responsibilities as the Democratic Caucus has ordered.

Finally, section 8 of my bill provides that any committee documents released for public dissemination, other than purely factual materials, must either be approved by the committee or subcommittee, and opportunity be afforded for minority views, or a disclaimer must be carried on the cover that the document does not necessarily represent the views of the committee.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusion that any amount of reforms or procedural tinkering will solve our problems. But, I do remain convinced that some former reforms are at the heart of our existing problems, and that some new procedures can assist in our efforts to restore the committee system to the vital policy role it should play.

Obviously, much more is needed, including leadership from the top. I detect that this is part of your aim as well—to help pull things together and give this House greater direction and cohesion, and for that you are to be commended. However, I would caution against doing this over and around the fractured body of our standing committee system. It still has a vital role to play and must be revived to do so. If we rely instead on only the top leadership, a few committee chairmen, and ad hoc task forces to draft legislation, we risk losing the deliberation, expertise and representative character of the committee system. We risk producing instead both bad legislation and bad policy, not to mention partisan confrontation both within the Congress and with the Executive.

We share the same goals of making this House work for the good of the country. But let us recognize the need to return to a representative, accountable, and deliberative committee system to accomplish that worthwhile goal.

I urge my colleagues to study my proposals carefully and welcome their cosponsorship. At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a brief summary of my resolution. The summary follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENTS

(Amendments to House Rules Proposed by Representative Lott)

Sec. 1. *Title*: "Committee Improvement Amendments of 1987."

Sec. 2. *Oversight Reform*.—Committees would be required to formally adopt and submit to the Government Operations Committee by March 1st of the first session their oversight plans for that Congress. The Government Operations Committee, after consultation with the majority and minority leaders, would report the plans to the House by March 15th together with its recommendations, and those of the joint leadership group to assure coordination between committees. The Speaker would be authorized to appoint ad hoc oversight committees for specific tasks from the membership of committees with shared jurisdiction. Committees would be required to include an oversight section in their final activity report at the end of a Congress.

Sec. 3. *Multiple Referral of Legislation*.—The joint referral of bills to two or more committees would be abolished, while split and sequential referrals would be retained, subject to time limits and designation by the Speaker of a committee of principal jurisdiction.

Sec. 4. *Committee Ratios*.—The party ratios on committees would be required to reflect that of the full House (except for Standards of Official Conduct which is bipartisan). The requirement would extend to select and conference committees as well.

Sec. 5. *Subcommittee Limits*.—No committee (except appropriations) could have more than six subcommittees, and no Members could have more than four subcommittee assignments.

Sec. 6. *Proxy Voting Ban*.—All proxy voting on committees would be prohibited.

Sec. 7. *Majority Quorums*.—A majority of the membership of a committee would be required for the transaction of any business.

Sec. 8. *Committee Documents*.—Draft reports on legislative measures must be available to committee members at least one legislative day prior the reporting of the measure. Other committee documents intended for public dissemination, other than factual materials, must either be voted on by the committee and opportunity afforded for additional views, or must carry a disclaimer on their cover that they have not been approved by the committee and do not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

Sec. 9. *Committee Staffing*.—Committee funding resolutions could not be considered until the House has first adopted a resolution from the House Administration Committee setting an overall limit on committee staffing for the session. The minority would be entitled to up to one-third of the investigative staff funds, on request. The overall committee staff limit for the 100th Congress could not be more than 90% of the total at the end of the 99th Congress.

VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROMOTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in recent days many in this country have discussed at great length the question of catastrophic

health insurance and how we can protect Americans from being wiped out by extraordinary medical expenses. Unfortunately, most of the approaches that have been discussed omit the great catastrophe in this country—the very large costs of nursing home and home health care. To me the great catastrophe in this country is that we do not have a way to pay those bills. We are now seeing older people bankrupting themselves in order to be eligible for nursing home care. In some jurisdictions we have seen the tragic spectacle of one older person having to sue another in order to be eligible for nursing home and home care services. I think this is one of the major gaps in health care coverage today and ought to be one of the principal approaches that we zero in on in our effort to cover the staggering costs of catastrophic illness.

The question, of course, Mr. Speaker, is how we tackle this issue at a time when we have very great budget deficits and when health care inflation is about three times the rate of inflation generally.

One of the approaches I think we might use in order to promote health care services and begin the development of a long-term health care policy is better use of volunteers, particularly older people who assist other older people.

I think every Member of this body, of course, is going to support voluntarism. This is a great American tradition, literally dating back to the covered wagon days to the present. We have seen the notion of neighbor helping neighbor being the cornerstone of our heritage. To promote further volunteer efforts and particularly in this area of long-term care services and seniors getting assistance in their home, I recently introduced with our colleagues, Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana and Mr. GOODLING of Pennsylvania, the Volunteer Services Promotion Act.

This legislation promote and recognizes volunteer service and particularly volunteer service where senior citizens help others.

It seems to me that this kind of recognition and promotion comes at a very much needed time. We have seen cutbacks in governmental spending for a variety of social services. The impending changes in the tax laws relating to charitable contributions and the increased incidents of poverty all have, I think, increased the need for volunteers.

Unfortunately, we do not do enough in our society to promote and recognize the volunteer. I think it would be fair to say that very often they do not even get thanked.

When you add on the high costs of volunteering, today the insurance costs of volunteering particularly can be very high, you see that there really is a need to promote more volunteer

efforts; particularly when those services assist senior citizens. Under the legislation that I have introduced, volunteers in selected programs to help seniors and others would be able to earn credits for their volunteer work.

□ 1700

Under our bill, volunteers in selected programs would be able to earn credits for their service. Any person over 60 could volunteer in exchange for a credit when they serve any other person over 60 or a low-income child. These credits could be accumulated and those earning them would have the option to use them for similar services for themselves and their families when needed.

One of the attractive parts of this legislation is no new Federal funds are needed to implement the bill, and no new Federal bureaucracies would be created.

What my legislation simply calls on is the Administration on Aging to use some of their existing money, money from their demonstration project account, to promote the volunteer service credit programs where seniors and others would be able to get help in their homes and in the community.

I think that this legislation, particularly, can help attack the long-term care issue, the question that we would like so much to deal with in this session as part of the catastrophic care package, and I think the bill does the very important function of encouraging capable individuals to volunteer in these home care programs so that a family member or a friend, perhaps in the years ahead, could receive benefits themselves as a result of the volunteer work that is being done today.

In my home State of Oregon, the Senior Services Division of the Human Resources Department is preparing contracts with community groups to implement service credits this spring. Under Oregon's plan, the State will provide \$3,000 of computer hardware to senior centers. The centers will recruit, train, and supervise volunteers, track credits, and insure the programs—all free of charge to the State. The Volunteer Partnerships for Independence Program will be up and running in a matter of weeks serving seniors in a number of the communities around the State. The willingness of the State and the senior centers to cooperate on these creative ventures gives a good indication of how successful we can be in establishing volunteer networks nationwide.

I note that our good Speaker here today comes from New York City, and there was a very large article on the front page of his hometown paper, the New York Times, 2 days ago, of exactly this kind of discussion, where senior citizens in the metropolitan New York and Washington areas were assisting others and were earning credit for

their volunteer effort, and then were in a position to cash in those credits for their families and their loved ones when they need home care. So the Speaker today, I think, will see a great deal of discussion and interest right in his home community about this concept.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by simply saying that I think every Member is aware that volunteers, and especially the elderly volunteers, are a great resource for our country. I believe the Volunteer Service Promotion Act gives us a chance to build and to build significantly on that volunteer network of senior citizens and others who would like to be involved in their community, would like the opportunity to help and who, in my view, ought to get much-deserved recognition and credit for the very helpful work and service they perform.

JONES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSERVATION, CREDIT AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT COMES TO ARKANSAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1987, our colleague Congressman ED JONES, chairman of the Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit and Rural Development, conducted field hearings for his subcommittee in Forrest City, AR. The hearings were informative and constructive.

While the Agriculture Committee will publish all the statements presented for later distribution, I would like to bring one of the witnesses' statements, in particular, to the immediate attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people.

Marlin Jackson, Arkansas Banking Commissioner and recognized expert on farm credit, stated in a dramatic and emotional presentation that the current farm policy is "fundamentally flawed" and has failed, and that immediate relief by the Congress is needed in order to avert a national disaster. Mr. Jackson went on to characterize the current farm crisis as economic carnage, likening the devastation it has wrought in Arkansas to that suffered during the Civil War.

Some might quarrel with the metaphor, but all observers must conclude that agriculture today is in a state of national economic crisis; that a national emergency exists, and that appropriate action should be taken. In the near future I will propose measures to declare an economic emergency in American agriculture, along with extraordinary action that must be taken to fight the disaster sweeping our heartland.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the statement of Mr. Jackson for the consideration of my colleagues.

**TESTIMONY OF HON. MARLIN D. JACKSON,
BANK COMMISSIONER, STATE OF ARKANSAS**

I am Marlin Jackson. I have the honor of having served almost 4 years as bank commissioner in Arkansas. As such, I have primary supervisory/regulatory authority over 175 state-chartered banks, 3 industrial thrift institutions, and 2 trust companies. I have similar responsibility and authority over 122 bank holding companies including 8 or 10 multi-bank holding companies. These institutions hold a cumulative total of approximately \$10 billion in funds belonging to the general public and likewise \$10 billion in assets representing the investment of these funds.

Prior to becoming bank commissioner I served almost 25 years as a commercial banker in community/agricultural banks situated in the Delta of northeast Arkansas. My banking experience has extensive involvement in Congressman Alexander's district and some involvement and frequent trips in Chairman Ed Jones' district.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Alexander, at the risk of appearing to engage in "political back-slapping" the urgency of the depression that has been ongoing in the farm belt is such that I am compelled to begin my testimony by recognizing your sense of awareness, your long-standing commitment to assisting agriculture, particularly the family-sized farming units, and your significant contribution to the preservation of the life, safety, and well-being of the Farm Credit System and perhaps to a lesser extent the significant assistance to the commercial banks throughout the farm belt. On behalf of bank regulators in the various states, the farmers, and those who extend credit, I express a profound appreciation for your leadership and encourage you to persevere in the face of adversity.

I bring to you no academic expertise, no international marks of distinction; rather I bring to you the scars and the afflictions of a career in agricultural/community banking.

The backbone of the economy of the United States and certainly the backbone of the economy in Arkansas is, and predictably will be in the foreseeable future, agriculture. Because agriculture is the backbone and life-blood of our economy throughout the farm belt, when agriculture becomes ill, our economy becomes ill; indeed, our communities, schools, churches, and banks have become ill. They have died of these illnesses.

There is unthinkable wanton waste that has been visited upon the American farmers and ranchers throughout America as a result of the David Stockman mentality. The farm program is an unthinkable, oppressive, and irresponsible act in any democracy and particularly of a democracy such as ours that believes "with equal freedom, liberty, and justice for all." There is neither equality nor is there opportunity for "the pursuit of happiness" to be found anywhere within the farm program under which America has suffered so grievously for the past half decade.

The rhetoric emanating out of the Administration that "farmers and ranchers" deserve better is a hollow recognition that the farm programs under which we operate are fundamentally flawed and are leading towards the devastation, the destruction to the most effective production of food and fibre unit in the world, i.e., the American farmers and ranchers.

In Arkansas, both as a banker and particularly during my tenure and in the execution

of my responsibilities as bank commissioner, I have observed tragedies that would be more consistent with an armed invasion.

The economic carnage existing throughout the farm belt, particularly in the Delta of Arkansas, is more similar to that following the devastation visited upon the land by the armies during the Civil War than that of a United States farm program/policy. Indeed, there are communities in which the only solvent businesses in the community, the only thing with the doors still open, are their small agriculture banks.

I was in a small town in east Arkansas twice in the last twelve months. On the first visit only the relatively new doctor's clinic and the bank were open. Because the doctor's constituents were not employed by companies that offered Blue Cross/Blue Shield, or other types of third party insurance, the doctor's patients could not pay the doctor, the doctor could not in turn pay the bank; the end result is that the doctor's clinic, the grocery stores, the Safeway Store, and the drug store have all closed. Their windows are either boarded up or bashed in. The bank stands alone, a silent sentry, grief stricken by the demise of its constituency. How long such an institution can stand is open to discussion. Whether such an institution can withstand the devastating ravages of this farm program or not is not in dispute. The inevitable is obvious, if something is not done and done quickly, the financial institutions, the Farm Credit System, the Farmers Home Administration, will suffer billions of dollars of losses which will relegate the present level of expenditures on a farm program that has not worked and will not work to relative insignificance.

When I became bank commissioner in 1983, the loan losses (does not include security losses, fraudulent transfers, misapplication of funds or any other type losses) in the banks of Arkansas were approximately \$34 million. In 1986 the loan losses in our state among commercial banks, not including the Farm Credit System or the FmHA, was between \$150 and \$160 million.

Gentleman, I have lived substantially all of my life in this state. I have devoted the last 35 years of my adult life either in farming, in teaching agriculture, in agriculture banks and I have never seen or read of such an unthinkable, callous, and indifferent approach to the legitimate needs of honest, God-fearing people as I have witnessed in the last 5 years as displayed by this Administration's attitude of "if given enough time" the program may work.

Time is important. Time is of the essence. It is time we put an end to the political rhetoric. It is time we recognized the function of democracy is to impose upon ourselves those disciplines, including disciplines of production, that we are unwilling to impose, particularly when driven by the forces of a highly competitive free market world, and particularly when encouraged by government policies of the past, to produce gluttonous amounts of surpluses to the extent that we are literally drowning ourselves in over-productivity and thus are forcing American farmers and ranchers deeper and deeper into the sink hole of insolvency.

The surplus of food, dairy products, fibre in our country and in a few other countries is a well-recognized fact. What is not well-recognized, is that there are millions, perhaps billions, of people in the world today who have an urgent need for food, not to grow fat but to sustain life. I am told by reliable forces both in the private and public

sector that the number of deaths per day from malnutrition, diet related diseases, far exceed the highest body count in the thick of wars which our country has been engaged in in the pursuit of freedom and to secure "prosperity" now and forever more.

We are indeed engaged in a war on a global battlefield. Our farmers have suffered the heel of oppression of ill-founded, ill-conceived, and poorly implemented foreign policies in the form of embargoes and the threats of embargoes across three or four administrations; they suffer under the heel of economic oppression bearing the brunt of a currency evaluation system that is driven primarily by international conglomerates, international robber money barons, that have brought devastation not only to agriculture but to all of Arkansas' export, import sensitive industries. Indeed, the economic death of our textile industry in the state, our shoe industry in the state, has already largely occurred.

The last hope—at the eleventh hour—is the sense of awareness that our Honorable Chairman, and our distinguished Congressman from Arkansas, have always displayed over the legitimate needs, concerns of the people of the United States, not limited to the constituents within their district.

I appeal to you to take immediate action to address the following issues:

Recognize that the present farm program is fundamentally flawed and enact so that it will become effective in 1987, a farm program that accomplishes the recognized highest and best goals of all proposals which are: (a) production constraints temporarily, to be phased out as the glut, the surplus is moved in to ultimate consumers by a wide array of urgently needed programs; and (b) transition from the present over-supply, transition from temporary production controls towards a free market concept;

2. Programs that recognize our American farmers are competing not with farmers but with foreign countries; thus, farm programs that provide "export enrichments/enhancements" so that our products are competitive in the world marketplace;

3. Programs that complete the job of ensuring the ongoing viability of the Farm Credit System and of equal or greater importance programs that will grant the same essential "time ingredients" to the commercial agriculture community banks as has been granted to the Farm Credit System, the savings and loan industry, the farmers under Chapter 12, and a wide array of commercial industrial giants such as all the steel companies which have availed themselves of relief that is denied under present federal and state banking regulation;

4. Mandate the secretary of agriculture to administer fairly the programs that have already been passed by the Congress to provide urgently needed relief for an increasingly large number of farmers and ranchers who cannot obtain adequate financing anywhere.

In conclusion, I thank you for the honor, the opportunity to appear before you; I thank you for the courtesies Mr. Chairman that you and your staff have always shown to me on infrequent occasions when I have visited our nation's capital. I shall forever be thankful and grateful for the outstanding leadership, for the enormous self-sacrifices made by our First Congressional Representative Bill Alexander, my dear friend. Bill Alexander is a friend not because I am without fault, but a friend of Marlin Jackson, of my family, my neighbors and a

friend of the first district, because of his strengths of character and not because of the absence of fault on our part.

Finally, gentlemen, I implore you to do whatever is necessary to make the members of the United States Congress aware of the fact that the depression on the farm is not political rhetoric; it is human lives; it's men, women, and children in this generation and in generations to come who are dying literally and economically because of the abuse placed upon them, the oppression placed upon them by unthinkable, proven unworkable farm programs.

If this farm program is left to run its course, predictably within a few years this country can and will be the hostage of "food cartels." The select few producers who are able to survive, can bring this nation, indeed the world, to its knees in a way that far surpasses the "energy cartel" of the Opec countries.

Thank you for the honor of appearing before you.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Chairman WILLIAM H. GRAY III, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the updated current level of spending, credit, and revenues for fiscal year 1987. The first current level report of this session of Congress was filed on January 21, 1987. Since that report, Congress has completed action on and the President has signed the Emergency Supplemental for the Homeless, Public Law 100-6, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, Public Law 100-4, changing budget authority and outlay estimates for fiscal year 1987.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

Current level reports are intended to provide Members information to compare enacted spending and revenues with the aggregate ceilings on budget authority, outlays, and revenues established in a budget resolution; and also to compare enacted legislation with the allocations of new discretionary budget authority, entitlement authority and new credit authority made to a committee pursuant to subsection 302(a) of the Budget Act, as amended. This report compares the spending, credit, and revenue levels in current level with those assumed in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1987—Senate Concurrent Resolution 120—adopted on June 26, 1986.

Current level reports provide information that is necessary for enforcing section 311 of the Budget Act, as amended. Subsection 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure if the adoption of that

measure would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level of revenues set in the budget resolution.

Subsection 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures which would breach the ceilings on total spending set in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of discretionary spending authority made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Such an exception was first provided by the budget resolution for fiscal year 1985—House Concurrent Resolution 280, 98th Congress. The exception was made permanent by the amendments to the Budget Act included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985—Public Law 99-177, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. This exception is intended to protect a committee that has stayed within its allocation of discretionary budget authority and new entitlement authority from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control. The fiscal year 1987 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 120 were printed in House Report 99-666, July 9, 1986.

Section 311(c) of the Budget Act, provides that for purposes of enforcing section 311 in the House of Representatives the levels of new budget authority, entitlement authority, outlays and revenues shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget. Current level reports represent partial fulfillment of this enforcement responsibility of the Budget Committee by providing both estimates of enacted aggregate spending and revenues; and, for purposes of determining the applicability of the section 311(b) exception, estimates of the relationship between the budgetary effect of enacted legislation within a committee's jurisdiction and the allocation of spending authority made to that committee.

Current level estimates are based on economic and technical assumptions in place at the time of the adoption of the budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 120, on June 26, 1986. This is intended to protect committees which acted on the basis of the assumptions of the budget resolution from changes in economic and technical factors over which they have no control. Unless the Congress adopts a subsequent budget resolution which alters the assumptions about legislative actions, committees should be able to expect that measures that conform with the budget resolution will not be subject to points of order for violation of the Budget Act. To do otherwise and base enforcement on constantly changing economic and technical estimates would seriously disrupt the legislative process, penalize committees which are unable to complete work on legislation within a short period after adoption of a budget resolution, and undermine respect for budget enforcement procedures.

In addition to section 311, the Budget Act contains another point of order which requires Budget Committee estimates for enforcement. Section 302(f) of the Budget Act, as amend-

ed, prohibits the consideration of a measure providing new budget authority, entitlement authority, or new credit authority if the adoption of that measure would cause a committee to exceed its allocation of new spending or credit authority made pursuant to subsection 302(b) of the Budget Act. The 302(b) allocation is a subdivision of the new spending, entitlement, and credit authority allocated to a committee pursuant to section 302(a), among either the subcommittees of that committee or among programs over which the committee has jurisdiction. This provision was added to the Budget Act by the amendments included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Section 302(g) provides that the enforcement of section 302 shall be based on estimates of spending and credit authority made by the Committee on the Budget. The Budget Committee intends to fulfill this responsibility by providing, as necessary, a separate section 302 status report to the Speaker.

For information purposes only, current level reports will continue to include a comparison of the budget and credit authority divided among the Appropriations subcommittees by that committee's 302(b) division with the actual enacted spending and credit legislation within each subcommittee's jurisdiction.

As chairman of the Budget Process Task Force, and on behalf of Chairman GRAY, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,

Washington, DC, February 25, 1987.

HON. JAMES C. WRIGHT, JR.,

Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

I am herewith transmitting the status report under S. Con. Res. 120, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1987.

In the House of Representatives, the procedural situation with regard to the spending ceilings (total budget authority and total outlays) is affected by Section 311(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended by P.L. 99-177. Enforcement against possible breaches of the spending ceilings under 311(a) of the Budget Act would not apply when a measure would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" made pursuant to Section 302(a) of the Budget Act. The appropriate 302(a) allocation includes "new discretionary budget authority", "new entitlement authority", "new direct loan obligations" and "new primary loan guarantee commitments." It should be noted that under this procedure the committee's outlay allocation is not considered.

The intent of Section 311(b) of the Budget Act is to protect a committee that has stayed within its spending authority and credit authority allocations—discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, direct loan authority, and loan guarantee authority—from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control.

The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on S. Con. Res. 120 were printed in H. Rept. 99-666 (July 9, 1986).

The enclosed tables compare enacted legislation to each committee's 302(a) allocation of discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments. The estimates of spending and revenues for purposes of the application of points of order under the Budget Act are based upon the economic and technical assumptions underlying the most recently agreed to budget resolution.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. GRAY III,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1987 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 120

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF FEBRUARY 24, 1987

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level.....	1,093,350	995,000	852,400
Current level.....	1,074,505	990,470	860,137
Amount under ceilings.....	18,845	4,530	
Amount over ceilings.....			
Amount under floor.....			
Amount over floor.....			7,737

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$18,845 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1987, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 120 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure providing budget or entitlement authority which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$4,530 million in outlays for fiscal year 1987, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 120 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss which is not included in the current level estimate and exceeds \$7,737 million for fiscal year 1987, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in S. Con. Res. 120.

Fiscal year 1987 budget authority comparison of current level and budget resolution allocation by committee pursuant to section 302

[In millions of dollars]

	Current level
House authorizing committee: budget authority	
Agriculture.....	(+960)
Armed Services.....	(...)
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.....	(+110)
District of Columbia.....	(...)
Education and Labor.....	(+10)
Energy and Commerce.....	(+692)
Foreign Affairs.....	(+1)

	Current level
Government Operations.....	(...)
House Administration.....	(...)
Interior and Insular Affairs.....	(+175)
Judiciary.....	(-53)
Merchant Marine and Fisheries.....	(+93)
Post Office and Civil Service.....	(+105)
Public Works and Transportation.....	(-10,461)
Science and Technology.....	(+2)
Small Business.....	(+438)
Veterans' Affairs.....	(...)
Ways and Means.....	(+530)

Note.—Committees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(a) allocation.

FISCAL YEAR 1987 BUDGET AUTHORITY COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION SUBDIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

[In millions of dollars]

	House Appropriations subcommittee subdivisions	Current level budget authority	Direct loans	Primary loan guarantees
Commerce, State, Justice.....	(-548)	(...)	(-24)	
Defense.....	(-5,468)	(...)	(...)	
District of Columbia.....	(-1)	(...)	(...)	
Energy and Water.....	(-541)	(+2)	(...)	
Foreign Operations.....	(+405)	(-187)	(-26)	
HUD/Independent Agencies.....	(-1,427)	(-21)	(+12,434)	
Interior.....	(-248)	(...)	(...)	
Labor, HHS, Education.....	(+135)	(+142)	(+15)	
Legislative Branch.....	(-23)	(...)	(...)	
Military Construction.....	(-66)	(...)	(...)	
Rural development and agriculture.....	(+114)	(-396)	(+12)	
Transportation.....	(-38)	(-24)	(...)	
Treasury, Postal Service.....	(-3)	(...)	(...)	
Total.....	(-7,709)	(-484)	(+12,411)	

Note.—Subcommittees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(b) subdivisions of discretionary action.

FISCAL YEAR 1987 ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY (NEA) PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

[In millions of dollars]

	Committee	Allocation	Enacted
Armed Services.....		0	+1,469
Education and Labor.....		+11	-45
Energy and Commerce.....		+108	+145
Foreign Affairs.....		0	+1
Interior and Insular Affairs.....		0	+205
Judiciary.....		0	+9
Post Office and Civil Service.....		-100	0
Veterans' Affairs.....		+172	+122
Ways and Means.....		-315	-2,891

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 25, 1987.

Hon. WILLIAM H. GRAY, III,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, estimated revenues, and direct and guaranteed loan levels in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the 1987 budget (S. Con. Res. 120). This report for fiscal year 1987 is tabulated as of close of business February 24, 1987. A summary of this tabulation is as follows:

	[In millions of dollars]		
	Current level	Budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 120	Current level +/ - resolution
Budget authority.....	1,074,505	1,093,350	-18,845
Outlays.....	990,470	995,000	-4,530
Revenues.....	860,137	852,400	7,737
Direct loan obligations.....	33,842	34,550	-708
Guaranteed loan commitments.....	114,964	100,750	14,214

Since my last report Congress has completed action on the Emergency Supplemental for the Homeless, P.L. 100-6, and the Water Quality Act of 1987, P.L. 100-4, changing budget authority and outlay estimates for 1987. Additionally, the estimate for Civilian agency pay raises reflects the President's request of January 28, 1987.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

RUDOLPH G. PENNER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 100TH CONG., 1ST SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1987 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS FEB. 24, 1987

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues.....			860,137
Permanent appropriations and trust funds.....	736,715	637,442	
Other appropriations.....	533,965	549,329	
Offsetting receipts.....	-196,917	-196,917	
Total enacted in previous sessions.....	1,073,763	989,854	860,137

II. Enacted this session:			
Water Quality Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-4).....	-4	-4	
Emergency Supplemental for the Homeless (P.L. 100-6).....	-7	-1	
Total enacted this session.....	-11	-5	

III. Continuing resolution authority.

IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses.

V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory items requiring further appropriation action.

Claims, defense.....	11	11	
Payments to air carriers, DOT.....	2	2	
Retired pay—Coast Guard.....	6		
Family social services.....	61		
Guaranteed student loans.....	140		
Special milk program.....	8	3	
Advances to unemployment trust fund ¹	(9)	(9)	
Black lung disability trust fund.....	314	314	
Veterans readjustment benefits.....	9	9	
Civilian agency pay raises.....	202	282	
Total entitlements.....	753	621	

Total current level as of Feb. 24, 1987..... 1,074,505 990,470 860,137

1987 budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 120)..... 1,093,359 995,000 852,400

Amount remaining:
Over budget resolution..... 18,845 4,530 7,737

¹ Interfund transactions do not add to budget totals.

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

SUBMISSION OF RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF THE HOUSE FOR THE 100TH CONGRESS

(Mr. DIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the 100th Congress in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee on February 25, 1987.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT—100TH CONGRESS

PART I—SCOPE AND AUTHORITY

Scope and Authority

RULE 1. (a) These rules govern the procedures to be followed by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"). So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of each subcommittee of the Committee, but each subcommittee may prescribe additional rules not inconsistent therewith.

(b) These rules are adopted under the authority of clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 100th Congress.

PART II—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

Subcommittees

RULE 2. (a) The Chairman may establish subcommittees and may assign to them such functions as he may deem advisable. The membership of each subcommittee shall provide equal representation for the majority and minority parties. The Chairman may refer any bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter before the Committee to an appropriate subcommittee for consideration and may recall any such bill, resolution, investigation, or other matter from the subcommittee to which it was referred.

(b) Any member of the Committee may sit with any subcommittee, but only regular members of the subcommittee may vote on any matter before the subcommittee.

Meetings

RULE 3. (a) The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month, except when the House is not meeting on that day. When the Chairman determines that there is sufficient reason, he may call a meeting on additional days. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held when the Chairman determines there is no business to be considered.

(b) Insofar as practicable, notice will be provided seven days in advance of meetings. However, the Chairman may, in his discretion, waive such time period for good cause.

Members Required for Quorums and Committee Action

RULE 4. (a)(1) A quorum of the Committee consists of a majority of the members of the Committee.

(2) A quorum of a subcommittee consists of a majority of the members of the subcommittee.

(b) Except as provided in clause 4(e)(2)(A) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rules 5, 8, 12, 16, and 17 of the Committee rules, action may be taken by the Committee by a simple majority, a quorum being present.

Broadcasts of Committee Proceedings

RULE 5. (a) Whenever any hearing or meeting by the Committee is open to the public, the Committee may permit, except as provided in clause (b) of this rule, by a vote of a majority of the Committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio

broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage, under the following rules:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness shall be required against his or her will to be photographed or to otherwise have a graphic reproduction of his or her image made at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio coverage at a hearing, all microphones shall be turned off, at the request of any witness who does not wish to be subjected to television or still photography coverage at a hearing, all lenses shall be covered, and at the request of a witness who does not wish to have a graphic reproduction of his or her image made at a hearing, the making of such a reproduction at the hearing shall not be permitted. This paragraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing or meeting room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the Committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(b) Coverage by radio, television, still camera, or electronic recording device of any disciplinary hearing held under subpart B of part III of the Committee rules is prohibited.

Committee Records

RULE 6. (a) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of the Committee, establish such procedures as in the Chairman's judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any testimony or other information received by the Committee or its staff.

(b) Unless otherwise authorized by the Committee, no information received by the Committee respecting any alleged violation by a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of the Code of Official Conduct or of any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the conduct of such Member, officer, or employee in the performance of his duties or the discharge of his responsibilities shall be disclosed to the public before the transmittal under rule 11 of the Committee rules to such Member, officer, or employee of a Statement of Alleged Violation in connection with such violation. After the service of such a Statement on the Member, officer, or employee—

(1) the Statement and any other paper filed pursuant to rule 12 of the Committee rules respecting such violation shall be

made available for public inspection at reasonable hours, and

(2) any other paper filed with the Committee respecting such violation shall be made available as authorized by the Committee, except that no paper shall be made available if its disclosure would violate any Executive Order or any Federal law or regulation.

Special Procedures

RULE 7. The Committee may adopt by resolution any special procedures deemed necessary to a particular matter before the Committee. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties and witnesses in the matter.

Changes in Committee Rules

RULE 8. The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee if before such vote written notice of the proposed modification, amendment, or repeal was provided each member of the Committee.

PART III—COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY

Subpart A—Complaints and committee inquiries

Complaints

RULE 9. (a) A complaint submitted to the Committee under clause 4(e)(2)(B) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be in writing and under oath, setting forth in simple, concise, and direct statements—

(1) the name and legal address of the party filing the complaint (hereafter referred to as the "complainant");

(2) the name and position or title of the Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives alleged to be in violation of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct;

(3) the nature of the alleged violation, including, if possible, the specific section of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct alleged to have been violated; and

(4) the facts alleged to give rise to the violation. When facts are alleged upon the information and belief of the complainant, the complaint shall so state and set forth the basis for such information and belief.

(b) All documents in the possession of the complainant that are relevant to and in support of the allegations shall be appended to the complaint.

(c) A complaint by a Member of the House of Representatives may be transmitted directly to the Committee. A complaint by an individual not a Member of the House may be transmitted through a Member who agrees, in writing, to accept it for that purpose. If a complaint by an individual not a Member of the House is submitted to three Members of the House who refuse, in writing, to transmit the complaint to the Committee, the complainant may transmit the complaint directly to the Committee, provided an affidavit is attached stating, under oath, the names of the Members to whom the complaint was submitted and by whom it was rejected in writing.

Processing of Complaints

RULE 10. (a)(1) The staff of the Committee shall examine each complaint submitted to the Committee for compliance with clause 4(e)(2)(B) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule 9 of the Committee rules.

(2) If the staff determines that a complaint does not comply with such House and

Committee rules, the complaint shall be returned to the complainant with a general statement that the complaint is not in compliance with such rules and a copy of such rules. A complainant may resubmit a complaint.

(3) If the staff determines that a complaint is in compliance with such House and Committee rules, the complaint shall be filed with the Committee. Within five days of the filing of a complaint (A) a copy of the complaint, showing the date of its filing, shall be transmitted to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee, and (B) every other member of the Committee shall be notified of the filing of the complaint and of its availability for inspection by the member in the Committee offices. Upon the request of any member of the Committee, the staff of the Committee shall inform the member of the complaints which have been filed with the Committee and which are pending before the Committee.

(4) If within thirty days of the date of the filing of a complaint the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee jointly—

(A) decide to place the complaint on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee, it shall be so placed on such agenda, or

(B) determine that the complaint be dismissed because it fails to allege facts which constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or applicable law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct, the complaint together with the determination that it should be dismissed shall be placed on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee.

Unless the Committee determines under clause (b) that the complaint merits further inquiry, the complaint shall be dismissed and the complainant shall be notified of the dismissal. If upon the expiration of such thirty days, the Chairman and ranking minority member have not taken any joint action respecting the complaint, it shall be placed on the Committee agenda for consideration at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee.

(b) At the meeting at which the Committee is to consider a complaint filed with the Committee, the Committee shall determine whether the violation alleged in the complaint is within the jurisdiction of the Committee and, if so, whether the allegations in the complaint merit further inquiry. The complainant and respondent shall be notified, in writing, of action taken by the Committee respecting the complaint.

Preliminary Inquiry and Statement of Alleged Violation

RULE 11. (a)(1) If the Committee determines under rule 10(b) that the allegations of a violation in a complaint filed with the Committee merit further inquiry, the Committee shall conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether such violation occurred.

(2) In the preliminary inquiry—

(A) the Committee shall provide the respondent an opportunity to present to the Committee, orally or in writing, a statement respecting the allegations with respect to which the inquiry is being held,

(B) the staff may interview witnesses and examine documents and other evidentiary matter,

(C) the Committee may order the testimony of witnesses to be taken under oath, in which event the oath may be administered

by a member of the Committee or by any person authorized by law to administer oaths,

(D) the Committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things as it deems necessary to the conduct of the inquiry, and

(E) any probative evidence may be used.

Upon the completion of the preliminary inquiry, the staff of the Committee shall prepare and transmit to the Committee a report containing a comprehensive summary of the information received in the inquiry and may include in the report a recommendation for action by the Committee respecting the alleged violation which was the subject of the inquiry.

(b) If the Committee determines on the basis of the report of the Committee staff on the preliminary inquiry respecting an alleged violation that there is reason to believe that the violation occurred, the Committee may direct the staff to transmit to the respondent a Statement of Alleged Violation. A Statement shall be divided into counts and each count shall relate to a separate violation and shall contain a plain and concise statement of the alleged facts of such violation and include a reference to the provision of the Code of Official Conduct or law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct alleged to have been violated.

Answers and Motions and Committee Action

RULE 12. (a) If a Statement of Alleged Violation is transmitted under rule 11(b) of the Committee rules, the respondent receiving the Statement shall have not less than 21 days in which to respond to it. The response shall be by way of answer or motion, shall be in writing and signed by the respondent or his counsel, and shall be limited to the following:

(1) An admission to or denial of, under oath, each count set forth in the Statement. A denial may include (A) negative and affirmative defenses to the allegations in a count, and (B) any supportive evidence and any other relevant information which the respondent may desire to submit.

(2) An objection to any count in the Statement on the grounds that it fails to state facts which constitute a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any other applicable law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct.

(3) An objection to the jurisdiction of the Committee to consider the allegations contained in the Statement.

(4) A motion for a bill of particulars.

(5) An objection to the participation of any member of the Committee in the consideration of the allegations contained in the Statement on the grounds that the member cannot render an impartial and unbiased decision. The Committee member against whom the objection is made shall be the sole judge of his qualifications. A motion under this paragraph is not in lieu of an answer.

Any motion submitted pursuant to this clause shall be accompanied by a memorandum of points and authorities. Except for good cause shown, no pleading or motion not described in paragraphs (1) through (5) will be considered by the Committee and the Committee will not consider any answer or motion described in such paragraphs which is submitted under this clause after the expiration of such 21 days.

(b) Within 30 days after the receipt of any motion under clause (a) respecting a State-

ment, the Committee shall consider such motion. Notice of the decision of the Committee respecting the motion shall be furnished the respondent who submitted it. When the Committee has acted on all motions submitted under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of clause (a), the respondent shall, in accordance with paragraph (1) of such clause, submit, within fourteen days of the date of the last Committee action, an answer to each count in the Statement not dismissed by the Committee.

(c) Failure to submit, within the applicable time period, an answer to a count of a Statement which has not been dismissed by the Committee shall constitute an admission to the violation alleged in the count.

(d) The Chairman, in his discretion, may extend any time limitation imposed by clause (a) or (b) if he determines that the extension would facilitate a fair and complete inquiry and may shorten any such time limitation if he determines that there are special circumstances which require the shortening of such time limitation.

(e)(1) As soon as practicable after the expiration of all applicable time limitations for action under clauses (a) and (b) respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee shall act, by the vote of a majority of the members of the Committee, to—

(A) hold a disciplinary hearing on the violation charged in the Statement, or

(B) defer action on the Statement but only if there is a judicial proceeding pending.

Failure to achieve a vote of the majority of the members of the Committee on a motion to take any action described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall constitute dismissal of the Statement.

(2) The respondent to a Statement of Alleged Violation shall be notified in writing of action taken under paragraph (1) by the Committee respecting the Statement.

Inquiries on the Committee's Initiative

RULE 13. Notwithstanding the absence of a complaint filed with the Committee under rule 10 of the Committee rules, the staff of the Committee shall present to it any evidence available to the staff reasonably indicating that any Member, officer, or employee may have committed a violation of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to his conduct in the performance of his duties or in the discharge of his responsibilities. If the Committee determines that the evidence presented by the staff of an alleged violation merits further inquiry, the Committee shall, in accordance with rule 11 (a) of the Committee rules, conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether such violation occurred. Rules 11 and 12 of the Committee rules shall apply to further proceedings respecting such alleged violation.

Committee Action After Criminal Convictions

RULE 14. If a Member, officer, or employee of the House is convicted in a Federal, State, or local court of a criminal offense for which a sentence of a term of imprisonment of at least one year may be imposed, the Committee shall conduct, in accordance with rule 11(a) of the Committee rules, a preliminary inquiry to review the evidence of such offense and to determine whether it constitutes a violation over which the Committee is given jurisdiction under clause 4(e) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives. If on the basis of the report of the Committee staff on the preliminary in-

quity the Committee determines that an offense was committed over which the Committee has jurisdiction under such clause, the Committee shall notify the Member, officer, or employee of its determination and shall hold a disciplinary hearing for the sole purpose of determining what action to recommend to the House respecting such offense. Such hearing shall be held in accordance with the requirements of rule 16 of the Committee rules applicable to the second phase of a disciplinary hearing and any recommendation made by the Committee shall be made in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee rules.

Definition

RULE 15. For purposes of this subpart and subpart B, the term "respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House who is charged in a complaint filed with the Committee under rule 10 of the Committee rules or who is charged in a Statement of Alleged Violation transmitted under rule 12 of the Committee rules.

Subpart B—Disciplinary hearings

Disciplinary Hearings

RULE 16. (a) A disciplinary hearing respecting a violation charged in a Statement of Alleged Violation shall be held to receive evidence upon which to base findings of fact and recommendations, if any, to the House respecting such violation. A disciplinary hearing shall consist of two phases. The first phase shall be for the purpose of determining whether or not the counts in the Statement have been proved. The second phase shall be for the purpose of determining what action to recommend to the House with respect to any count found to have been proved.

(b) At a disciplinary hearing the Committee may require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and other things as it deems necessary. Depositions, interrogatories, and sworn statements taken under Committee direction may be accepted into the Committee record. The procedures set forth in clause 2(k) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to disciplinary hearings.

(c) Prior to setting a date for a disciplinary hearing and issuing subpoenas for witnesses, the Committee shall resolve the scope and purpose of the hearing. A copy of this statement of scope and purpose shall be furnished to all witnesses. During the course of the hearing the Committee may expand or contract the scope in light of evidence received.

(d)(1) The order of phase one of a disciplinary hearing shall be as follows:

(A) The Chairman shall open the hearing by stating the Committee's authority to conduct the hearing, the purpose of the hearing, and its scope.

(B) Testimony from witnesses and other evidence pertinent to the subject of the hearing shall be received in the following order whenever possible: (i) witnesses and other evidence offered by the Committee staff, (ii) witnesses and other evidence offered by the respondent, and (iii) rebuttal witnesses.

(C) Witnesses at a hearing shall be examined first by the Committee counsel or authorized staff member. The Committee members may then question the witnesses under the five-minute rule. The respondent or his counsel may then cross-examine the witnesses. Redirect and recross may be per-

mitted in the Chairman's discretion. With respect to witnesses offered by the respondent, a witness shall be examined first by the respondent or his counsel, and then may be cross-examined by Committee counsel or authorized staff member. Committee members may then question the witness under the five-minute rule. Redirect and recross may be permitted in the Chairman's discretion.

(2) Testimony of all witnesses shall be taken under oath. The form of the oath shall be: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee in the matter now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?" The oath shall be administered by the Chairman or Committee member designated by him to administer oaths.

(e) At a disciplinary hearing the burden of proof rests on the staff with respect to each count to establish the facts alleged therein clearly and convincingly by the evidence that it introduces.

(f) Phase two of a disciplinary hearing shall consist of oral and/or written submission by counsel for the Committee and counsel for the respondent as to the sanction the Committee should recommend to the House of Representatives with respect to any count of the Statement of Alleged Violation which has been proved. Testimony by witnesses will not be heard at phase two except by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

Recommendations

RULE 17. (a)(1)(A) As soon as practicable after the completion of the first phase of a disciplinary hearing respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation, the Committee shall consider each count contained in the Statement and with respect to each count as originally drawn or as amended shall vote on a motion that the count has been proved. A count shall not be proved unless at least a majority of the Committee vote for a motion that the count has been proved. A count which is not proved shall be considered as dismissed by the Committee.

(B) If the Committee votes that a count has been proved, the Committee may upon completion of the second phase of the disciplinary hearing, by a majority vote of the Committee, consider and vote on a motion that a recommendation be made to the House for appropriate action respecting the violation charged in such count.

(2) If in a vote taken under paragraph (1)(A) respecting a count a majority of the Committee does not vote that the count has been proved, a motion to reconsider that vote may only be made by a Member who voted that the count was not proved. If in a vote taken under paragraph (1)(B) to adopt a recommendation to the House respecting a violation charged in a count a majority of the Committee does not vote in favor of the recommendation, a motion to reconsider that vote may only be made by a Member who voted against the recommendation.

(b)(1) With respect to any violation with which a Member of the House was charged in a count which the Committee has voted as proved, the Committee may include in its recommendation to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) Expulsion from the House.

(B) Censure.

(C) Reprimand.

(D) Fine.

(E) Denial or limitation of any right, power, privilege, or immunity of the Member if under the Constitution the House may impose such denial or limitation.

(F) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(2) With respect to any violation with which an officer or employee of the House was charged in a count which the Committee has voted as proved, the Committee may include in its recommendation to the House one or more of the following sanctions:

(A) Dismissal from employment.

(B) Fine.

(C) Any other sanction determined by the Committee to be appropriate.

(c)(1) The purpose of this clause is to inform the Members of the House of Representatives as to the general guidelines the Committee considers appropriate for determining which, if any, sanctions to recommend to the House respecting violations proved in a disciplinary hearing. This clause does not limit the authority of the Committee to make or not to make recommendations for such sanctions.

(2) For technical violations, the Committee may direct that the violation be reported to the House without a recommendation for a sanction.

(3) With respect to the sanctions which the Committee may determine to include in a recommendation to the House respecting a violation, reprimand is appropriate for serious violations, censure, is appropriate for more serious violations, and expulsion of a Member or dismissal of an officer or employee is appropriate for the most serious violations. A recommendation of a fine is appropriate in a case in which it is likely that the violation was committed to secure a financial benefit; and a recommendation of a denial or limitation of a right, power, privilege, or immunity of a Member is appropriate when the violation bears upon the exercise or holding of such right, power, privilege, or immunity.

(d) The Committee report accompanying a recommendation to the House adopted by the Committee under clause (a)(1)(B) respecting a violation charged in a count shall contain a brief but complete statement of the evidence which supported the finding as to that count and a brief statement of the Committee's reasons for the recommendation.

Disclosure of Evidence

RULE 18. Upon the request of a respondent, the Committee may permit the respondent to inspect, copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, or other tangible objects which the Committee intends to use as evidence against the respondent in a disciplinary hearing and which are material to the preparation of the defense of the respondent.

Subpart C—Evidence and Witnesses

Exculpatory Information

RULE 19. If the Committee at any time receives any exculpatory information respecting a Statement of Alleged Violation against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of the Code of Official Conduct or any law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct, it shall make such information available to such Member, officer, or employee.

Admissibility of Evidence

RULE 20. (a) Any evidence that is relevant and probative shall be admissible in any hearing of the Committee, unless the evidence is privileged or unless the Constitution otherwise requires its exclusion. Objections going only to the weight that should

be given to evidence will not justify its exclusion.

(b) The Chairman or other Member presiding at a hearing shall rule upon any question of admissibility at the hearing of testimony or evidence presented to the Committee. The Chairman or other Member presiding may limit the presentation of repetitious evidence. Rulings shall be final unless reversed or modified by a majority vote of the Committee members present.

Witnesses

RULE 21. (a) A subpoena to a witness to appear at a hearing shall be served sufficiently in advance of his scheduled appearance to allow him a reasonable period of time, as determined by the Committee, to prepare for the hearing and to employ counsel should he so desire.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically authorized by the Chairman, no member of the Committee or staff shall make public the name of any witness subpoenaed by the Committee before the date of his scheduled appearance.

(c) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights and to raise objections to procedures or to the admissibility of testimony and evidence. Counsel for a witness other than the respondent shall not be permitted to engage in oral argument with the committee. After a witness has testified, his counsel may submit to the Committee, in writing, any questions he wishes propounded to his client and any request for additional witnesses or other evidence. Such request may be granted at the Committee's discretion.

(d) The respondent may apply to the Committee for the issuance of subpoenas for the appearance of witnesses or the production of documents on his behalf. The application shall be granted upon a concise showing by the respondent that the proposed testimony or evidence is relevant and not otherwise available. The application shall be denied if not made at a reasonable time or if the testimony or evidence would be merely cumulative.

(e) Each witness subpoenaed by the Committee may sign appropriate vouchers for travel allowances and attendance fees, which may be obtained from the Committee staff.

(f) Each witness appearing before the Committee shall be furnished a printed copy of the rules of the Committee and the pertinent provisions of the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to the rights of witnesses.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. FAWELL) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LOTT, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLAKE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DERRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 60 minutes, on February 26.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WYDEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ESPY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COYNE, for 60 minutes, on February 26.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WYDEN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, on February 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FAWELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DANNEMEYER in three instances.

Mr. CRANE in six instances.

Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. MADIGAN.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. DIOGUARDI.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. BADHAM.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. COURTER.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FLAKE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. SOLARZ.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mrs. LLOYD.

Mr. TALLON.

Mr. HOYER in two instances.

Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.

Mr. McHUGH.

Mr. BEILSON in two instances.

Mr. LELAND.

Mrs. BYRON.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. DYSON.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

Mr. MOAKLEY.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 26, 1987, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

671. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting notice of a proposed new Federal records systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o), to the Committee on Government Operations.

672. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the agency's report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during the calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

673. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

674. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1986 annual report on research and demonstration projects in alternative coal mining technologies, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1211(f), 1267(g), 1295; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

675. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting the annual report of the Chief of Engineers for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

676. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense; transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

677. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authorization for the Office of the United States Trade Representative for fiscal years 1988 and 1989, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

678. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a copy of the monetary policy report for 1987, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 225a; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Education and Labor.

679. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting comprehensive reports on the first two projects negotiated under the Department of Energy's (DOE) Clean Coal Technology Demonstration Program, pursuant to Public Law 99-190; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space and Technology.

680. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the 1987 annual report that provides a description of 1986 accomplishments and planned activities for 1987

and 1988 at the western New York Nuclear Service Center near West Valley, NY, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2021a nt.; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Science, Space and Technology.

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. WOLPE (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. NEAL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 1231. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the President, the Vice President, certain other former Federal civilian and military personnel, and Members of Congress from representing or advising foreign persons for a period of 4 years after leaving Government service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 1232. A bill to provide for the adjustment of immigration status of certain nationals of Afghanistan in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEILENSEN (for himself, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. VENTO):

H.R. 1233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the tax on cigarettes to 40 cents per pack, and to provide annual adjustments to the rate of such tax based on increases in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 1234. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish an Office of Ethnic and Minority Affairs within the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. LENT, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 1235. A bill to provide benefits to merchant seamen who served in the U.S. Merchant Marine during World War II; jointly, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1236. A bill to amend section 1127 of the Food Security Act of 1985 to modify the export incentive program created by that section; jointly, to the Committee on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (by request):

H.R. 1237. A bill to amend the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, to provide for the reading of a tribute to the flag before the Pledge of Allegiance; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for insider trading of securities and related conduct; to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

H.R. 1239. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to promote competitiveness in the motor vehicle aftermarket and to preserve consumer freedom of choice to select parts and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIOGUARDI:

H.R. 1240. A bill to repeal the provision of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 which disallowed the treatment of certain technical personnel as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIOGUARDI (for himself, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 1241. A bill to establish the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the United States in the Executive Office of the President to direct and coordinate Federal financial management, and to establish an Office of the Assistant Secretary for Financial Management within each executive department and an Office of the Controller in each executive agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 1242. A bill to require retailers to collect sales and use taxes on interstate sales and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require such retailers to file information returns with the Internal Revenue Service for the purpose of assisting States in the collection of such taxes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York:

H.R. 1243. A bill to provide for the negotiation of certain miscellaneous tariff agreements with the Government of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYMALLY (for himself, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LELAND, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 1244. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain Filipino war veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. LOTT, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. COATS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HILER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 1245. A bill to provide Medicare catastrophic illness coverage, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, and Mr. MACKEY):

H.R. 1246. A bill to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to require commission merchants, dealers, and

brokers to label perishable agricultural commodities with the name of the country of origin of such commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 1247. A bill to amend the Saccharin Study and Labeling Act to extend the moratorium on the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to saccharin to May 1, 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mrs.

KENNELLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROE, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 1248. A bill to impose criminal penalties for damage to religious property and for injury to persons in the free exercise of religious beliefs and to provide for the collection of data about crimes motivated by racial, religious, or ethnic hatred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mrs.

KENNELLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROE, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JACOBS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. MCGRATH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal penalties for damage to religious property and for injury to persons in the free exercise of religious beliefs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1250. A bill to suspend most-favored-nation treatment to the products of Romania until that country recognizes and protects fundamental human rights, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 1251. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the Armed Forces to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. PETRI,

Mr. ROTH, Mr. STANGELAND, and Ms. SNOWE):

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to remove the requirement of a second repository for the disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 1253. A bill to assist the Secretary of Agriculture and the U.S. rice industry in their efforts to promote U.S. rice exports; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KASICH:

H.R. 1254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for employers which provide onsite day care services for dependents of their employees, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to replace the existing AFDC Program with a new and substantially revised assistance program which will more effectively serve to reduce poverty among children and their families, promote self-sufficiency, and strengthen family life; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 1256. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1988 through 1990, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.R. 1257. A bill to nullify the recent increases in certain executive, legislative, and judicial salaries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 1258. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide military retired pay to certain persons who were members of the U.S. merchant marine during World War II; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEATH of Texas (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. McEWEN):

H.R. 1259. A bill to recognize the organization known as the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWRY of Washington:

H.R. 1260. A bill to establish a program for the exploration for and commercial recovery of hard mineral resources on those portions of the seabed subject to the jurisdiction and control of the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1261. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain telescopes not designed for use with infrared light; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1262. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of Chinese gooseberries (kiwi fruit); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1263. A bill to implement the United States-European Communities Agreement on Citrus and Pasta; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to protect the benefit levels of individuals becoming eligible for

benefits in or after 1979 by eliminating the disparity (resulting from changes made in 1977 in the benefit computation formula) between those levels and the benefit levels of persons who became eligible for benefits before 1979; and to remove the ceiling on the amount of an individual's income which can be taken into account in computing his or her benefits and in determining his or her liability for social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. DE LA GARZA):

H.R. 1265. A bill to improve the administration of the Department of Agriculture commodity distribution activities, and for other purposes to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1266. A bill to provide for a 2-year pilot program in the Peace Corps for the purpose of providing, and training foreign nationals to provide, health care services in two host countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1267. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a limitation on the rates on credit card accounts, to provide that such limitation shall take effect on October 1, 1988, unless the determination is made that such rates reflect the cost of funds to creditors and competition among creditors for new credit card accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to allow insured banks to amortize losses on agricultural loans over a 10-year period and losses on other loans over a 5-year period; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize members of the Armed Forces to wear certain items of religious apparel while in uniform; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SUNIA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HATCHER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. SABO):

H.R. 1270. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Mrs. Jesse Owens; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 1271. A bill to establish a Department of Trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. STRATTON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WILSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. SHUMWAY):

H.R. 1272. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act and the Comprehensive Smokeless Tobacco Health Education Act of 1986 respecting the advertising of tobacco products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.R. 1273. A bill to repeal the restrictions added by the Tax Reform Act of 1986 on the deduction for retirement savings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAZIO (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.J. Res. 157. Joint resolution designating the week of April 26, 1987, through May 2, 1987, as "Hemochromatosis Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FAZIO (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ROE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1987 as "National Asthma and Allergy Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.J. Res. 159. Joint resolution to designate June 14, 1987, as "Baltic Freedom Day," and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should seek the support of other nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. QUILLLEN):

H. Res. 99. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Rules in the first session of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LOTT:

H. Res. 100. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to make the committee system more managea-

ble, accountable and effective by reducing subcommittees, subcommittee assignments, and staff sizes; eliminating the joint referral of bills, proxy voting and one-third quorums; restoring equitable party ratios and systematic oversight; and making committee documents more accurate and representative; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 101. Resolution establishing the Commission on the United States House of Representatives Bicentenary; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H. Res. 102. Resolution providing that the U.S. Navy should not deploy nuclear weapons on surface ships; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. Res. 103. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 1st session of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H. Res. 104. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the 1st session of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LELAND:

H. Res. 105. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Hunger in the 1st session of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 106. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Aging in the 1st session of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 1274. A bill to extend the patent numbered 3,387,268, "Quotation Monitoring Unit," for a period of 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARDEN:

H.R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Joyce G. McFarland; 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. 10: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VISCOSKY.

H.R. 67: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 121: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 134: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 177: Mr. ESPY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 178: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 179: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 180: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 181: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 198: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 199: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 201: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 240: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 247: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 261: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 286: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 287: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 288: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 289: Mr. FEIGHAN and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 290: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 308: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FROST, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. LELAND.

H.R. 309: Mr. WILSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 310: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 348: Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 378: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 434: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 459: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 461: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 543: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. LAFALE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 596: Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 653: Mr. YATRON and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 654: Mr. FRANK, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 661: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 681: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 692: Mr. HENRY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MACKEY, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 693: Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 722: Mr. BRENNAN.

H.R. 738: Mr. DIXON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 778: Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 779: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 786: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PRINCE of Illinois, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 796: Mr. MFUME, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 799: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FISH, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 809: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 810: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 819: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 900: Mr. COELHO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 905: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 910: Mr. STALLINGS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SABO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 933: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. YATES, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 966: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia.

H.R. 975: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. STARK, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SAWYER, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1002: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1063: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1069: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1073: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1085: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 1115: Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 1119: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, and Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 1170: Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SABO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1178: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 48: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BAKER, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. COURTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MOOREHEAD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. DORNAN of California and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.J. Res. 98: Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. THOMAS LUKEN, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. TALLON.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. CLARKE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. SWINDALL.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. ROEMER.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.J. Res. 127: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. McEWEN, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. COATS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHUMWAY, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr.

GARCIA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SABO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 11: Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. CLARKE and Mr. DARDEN.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ROE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs.

BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H. Res. 53: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H. Res. 68: Mr. DYSON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. YATRON, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. McEWEN.

H. Res. 90: Mr. BLAZ.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FIGHTING LADY

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, through the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] those of us working on boxing reform have been fortunate enough to benefit from the advice of Josephine Abercrombie, a new and constructive force in professional boxing. In the last session, a bill was passed in this body to set up a federally chartered nonprofit Boxing Commission to establish uniform health standards for boxing. In this new session, those of us involved, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. HALL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. YATRON, and myself will be renewing our efforts. With individuals like Mrs. Abercrombie participating in this reform the sport will be better off.

FIGHTING LADY

(By David Remnick)

To Pierce Egan, preeminent scribe of 19th century pugilism, boxing was "the manly art," a science not recommendable to those "who prefer effeminacy to hardihood." Egan's characters were Englishmen of every sort: swells and clinchpooes, champions as revered as Tom Cribb and Jem Belcher, personages as marginal as Jack (the Young Ruffian) Fearby and "Big" Ben Brain. There is not a notable woman in all the magnificent volumes of "Boxiana."

If Egan were alive today and furthering his research for his column in the sporting "Weekly Despatch," he might want to cross the Atlantic and attend the Thursday night fights at the Marriott Brookhollow in Houston. A shock would await him. The promoter for the evening's ballroom sock-up does not chomp a cigar or affect an electrified bouffant. Josephine Abercrombie is what Egan might have called a noblewoman of a "certain age," her age certainly being 60. She has been married and divorced five times and lives on a nine-digit oil, gas and real estate fortune left behind by her mother, Miss Lillie, and her daddy, Mr. Jim, the developer of a device that prevents oil wells from blowing out.

Blue-eyed, razor-boned and possessed of what Don King calls "a luminescent femininity," Abercrombie sits nervously at ringside in a silk dress and a fine fur coat, three strands of pearls at her powdered throat. She is nervous for the fighters she promotes and the fighters that her proxy, Bob Spagnola, manages for the Houston Boxing Association. She is, however, unperturbed by the grease, spit, blood, sweat and other airborne spumes that often lubricate a spectator's evening. One night Abercrombie was so enthralled with the victory of her fighter Choo Choo Dixon that she embraced him without mind to her new Adolfo. "The outfit suffered," she admits gravely, "but it survived. I was lucky it was black, blue and brown."

Mrs. A, as many call her, is a discerning sort. When she finds something repulsive, she says it is "not adorable." At ringside to-

night she watches a couple of unadorable cruiserweights, Louis Coleman and Sherman Griffith, make mud of Egan's art. In the first round Coleman puts Griffith on the canvas with his first punch, a parabolic right that could not have halved a sheet of balsa wood. Griffith then does the same to Coleman with an equally artless and pillowy left. Soon all hell breaks loose. Griffith batters Coleman stupid for an endless minute. Coleman, a muscle-bound lug the color of bittersweet chocolate, is suddenly slack and the shade of milky tea. His eyes are rheumy and very far away. "It's over," says the referee. "Not adorable," says Abercrombie.

Presently, a tall, gulleless girl in a microscopic bathing suit climbs between the ropes holding a card reading ROUND ONE. Abercrombie is seated near a couple of astro-nauts, a chirpy Cleveland talk-show host and Michael Hammond, the tweedy dean of the music school at Rice University. Abercrombie notes with evident concern that everyone is watching the snaky way the card girl has thrust herself between the ropes and into the ring, an endearing maneuver that would raise eyebrows even in Rio de Janeiro. "You know, when we started out five years ago, we had the most elegant girls with long white gloves and sequins," Abercrombie says. "That was in the beginning. Then we let the crowd vote on the outfits."

The girl climbs out and another bout begins, this one a snappier affair between a pair of bantamweights. One of them is her fighter Orlando Canizales, and Abercrombie notices a Nixonian shadow on his cheeks. Not adorable. "I do wish he'd shave before his fights, but I guess they'd drum me out of the corps if I suggested it," she says. Such is her sensibility. She has all the delicate reflexes of a Texas gentlewoman and all the savvy of a ring rat. She is, in spirit, a benevolent feudal lord, Tolstoyan in that regard. When she takes her fighters to charity balls, as she sometimes does, she lets them wear the dinner jackets of their choice, "but I won't let them wear blue ruffled shirts." She once brought four of her fighters to a fancy resort in Florida on her private plane. Five miles above sea level she taught "the boys" the intricacies of etiquette: napkin on the lap, this is the fish fork, this is the grapefruit spoon, don't drink from the finger bowl, etc. "I didn't want them to be embarrassed or uncomfortable," she says. "I'd say 'No! That's wrong!' They were cute about it. They want to be better."

Josephine's own etiquette, when one of her fighters is in the ring, is freewheeling, to say the least. It is an experience to sit next to her. From the moment the warriors come down the aisle in their bathrobes and climb through the ropes she is, she admits, "a shivering wreck." During the referee's instructions she assumes an erect posture, her hands balled into tiny, bony fists on her lap. Her guard is up from the opening bell in a mirror image of Canizales's own defenses. When he bounces off the ropes, so, perceptibly, does she. When a left comes whizzing toward his chin, Abercrombie's head reacts into her shoulders, turtle like. All the while she is bobbing and weaving, sometimes boring her shoulder into her neighbor's back. A sharp blow to the ribs may follow.

"Oh! Did I hurt you?" she will say after belting someone quite unconsciously. "I just completely forget myself!" There is something at once frenzied and repressed about her performance; she is wild, yet mindful of not letting go completely. Which is to say, she knocks no one out.

At the bell ending the first round Abercrombie slumps in her chair. While her fighter is toweled, tutored and greased, she retrieves an ivory linen handkerchief from her purse and, quite delicately, dabs the sweat from her pulse points and brow. Canizales spits into a bucket, though his promoter most certainly does not.

In the second round it seems for a moment that Abercrombie has more endurance than Canizales. Her guard is still up while his is dropping. Canizales takes a stiff shot to the jaw, and Abercrombie cringes in sympathetic pain. "Sometimes when he fights I think I'm going to die," she says. But her faith never wavers. Nor does her attention. Suddenly it is over. Canizales stops his man with a cute uppercut to the body and an irrelevant tap to the ear. The telling blow has a deep thudding sound, much like a car hitting a deer. Abercrombie worries for a moment over the beaten man. "I hope he's all right!" A doctor gives the thumbs-up. Now Abercrombie takes on a touching, motherly air.

"Oh, Orlando," she cries. "I'm so proud of you!"

For years, for centuries it seems, boxers have tried to sail between Scylla and Charybdis, a frizzy-haired ex-con named Don King and a wiley Harvard lawyer named Bob Arum. King and Arum control the financial side of the sport. One would not want to cast any aspersions in this space, but it is not unfair to say that King and Arum, while of differing casts, have similar, titanic reputations. Few have escaped one or the other. There are some lucky ones. Sugar Ray Leonard is well served by Mike Trainer, and young Olympic gold medalist Mark Breland has an honorable handler in Shelly Finkel. There are a few others who speak up for fairness to the fighter. May their tribe increase.

For the last four years word has passed in prizefighting that another such figure has entered the business—an immensely wealthy woman in Houston who has adored the prize ring from the moment her parents took a glamorous three-day train ride to New York in June 1938 and she saw Joe Louis knock out Max Schmeling in the first round. "My mother was just settling her skirts and all of a sudden there was this man lying on the canvas! She said, 'You mean we came all this way to see that?' Well, my mother couldn't understand it, but I was just fascinated!"

Who could resist the idea of Josephine Abercrombie, so primed and perfumed, in a sport that smells like the snuffed-out end of an old cigar? And how did the fight game greet her? "When I got into it, I think everyone thought I was playing or kidding around," she says one evening at home. "It was like, Who's that old broad? She doesn't know what she's doing. It's a game for her. She'll get tired of it." The estimable Eileen Eaton used to promote fights on the West

● 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.

Coast from 1942 until she retired in 1980. By phone from Los Angeles she says, "It's not easy, my boy. Men don't want to do business with a woman. Not in boxing they don't. I wonder how Miss Abercrombie is doing."

Abercrombie lives alone in the River Oaks section of Houston, the opulent neighborhood of her girlhood, where ersatz Spanish abuts ersatz Colonial abuts ersatz Bauhaus. Her own manse is behind a wall and shaded by dozens of trees.

The house is a clash of ambitions, a combination of Texas nouveau bigness and quasi-European glitz, with Louis XIV furniture and conspicuous antique volumes of Austen, Richardson, Dickens and Smollet. To guard it all from invaders she has a working alarm and a weimaraner attack dog named Bunker. "Bunker can attack, but I don't know how to make him stop," she says. "Isn't that something?"

The most genuine extension of Abercrombie and her passions here is the horsiness of the paintings and the rest of the library. There are racing prints and portraits on nearly every wall. Issues of the *Daily Racing Form* dangle from long spindles. Vernon's "History and Romance of the Horse" and Bayliss's "Matriarchy of the American Turf" are among the most used looking volumes in the place.

"I love horses more than anything, don't you?"

The only child of Mr. Jim Abercrombie and the former Miss Lillie Frank, of Lake Charles, La., little Josephine was torn between her father's thoroughbreds and hunting dogs and her mother's acute sense of southern ladyhood. To look at her, so slender, polite and charming, you would think that Abercrombie is Miss Lillie's girl through and through. It was, however, the horses who won out.

She was obsessed with animals of all kinds from the start. When the family was living in a suite at Houston's Warwick Hotel she kept rabbits, birds, chickens, ducks and an alligator in the pantry. She learned to ride at the Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs and at her father's ranch, just south of San Antonio. "I loved it. I loved being with him."

By the time she was 28, Abercrombie had taken 12 first-place ribbons at the National Horse Show at Madison Square Garden and *Sports Illustrated* had featured her in a story called "The Lady Who Won Too Often" (Nov. 1, 1954). She was portrayed as "retiring, with a contempt for flamboyance that makes Garbo seem gaudy. She pales at the mention of money, reddens at the words 'Edna Ferber' and took to her bed at the Hotel Pierre during a recent visit when a gossip columnist reported her weekly allowance to be \$25,000. ('Absolutely fantastic!') ... She hates stuffed shirts, fish and hats, in that order, although she recently commissioned Mr. John to design her 'a hat that wouldn't scare a horse.' She likes white gloves, chocolate in any form and hamburgers. 'I love your apartment,' she said recently to Betty Betz, a friend with whom she stays often in New York. 'It's so convenient to Harry Winston (a local diamond merchant) and Hamburg Heaven.'"

Abercrombie is rather less breathless than she was 32 years ago. By way of explaining how she "got into all this," she crosses one ankle over the other and folds her hands on her lap in the demure manner of her station and says, "When I was a girl my mother had me take lessons in everything. I learned ballet, riding, piano, golf, tennis, swimming,

ballroom dancing, elocution. She would have adored it if I had put on a hat and gloves and gone out to have lunch or tea with the girls. But I didn't want to do that."

"She wanted me to make my debut, of course, but I didn't want to come out. You know, one of those debutante things at the Allegro Club or the River Oaks Country Club. I thought it was like being put up on an auction block with someone saying, 'Here she is, come and get her.' She would have adored that, too. But I was different. My friends have always thought I was odd, different, because I don't enjoy the things I'm supposed to enjoy."

"I like a man's world. I like what happens in a man's world. I have lots of friends who are women, but I'm more comfortable with a man than I am with a woman. I love competition, and boxing is the ultimate one-on-one competition. You see so much courage displayed; you see chickenism happen, too. You see it all. At the end of the fight they are just exhausted because they're put so much into it. I just adore it."

By now, her ankles are still crossed, but her hands have become fists and are up near her temples in the manner of Floyd Patterson. Peekaboo-style.

Boxing is about the worst advertisement for a free-market system imaginable. It doesn't say much for states' rights, either. Even though the preponderance of commissioners, rulings, hearings and owners tends to sap some of the delight out of baseball, football and basketball, overwhelming them with a righteous brand of bureaucracy, boxing is something of an outlaw game, rife with greed, confusion and sleaze. The only rules are Marquis of Queensberry; outside the ring it's open season. Without a national boxing commission to police it, to enforce and improve safety regulations, some promoters and even some of the state commissions live only by the color of money.

"I want to make boxing better," says Josephine Abercrombie at the HBA gym. "That's what I want more than anything." With sweaty pugs all around her, she is as cool and self-assured as Jackie Kennedy at the Paris Opera. The place is nothing like the gyms of Body and Soul and The Harder They Fall. Carpeted, clean and warm, the gym is bad for movies, good for athletes. There is even a curious lack of stink in the air, although, Abercrombie assures her visitor, "sometimes, late in the day, the place smells just like Gleason's. Just lovely."

In the back there are Nautilus machines, computer-monitored speed bags, a water-filled heavy bag, and a series of conditioning geegaws: a "flexometer" to increase the speed with which a fighter ducks a blow; a "tensionmeter" to measure his isometric strength; a "balanceometer" to help him keep his feet; and, most heinous of all, the StairMaster, a revolving climbing machine that causes the thigh and butt to burn. "I've got one at home," Abercrombie says. "Keeps you hard for skiing."

When the fighters are not working out in Houston under the watch of trainers, a nutritionist and other cornermen, they are often training at the 6,000-acre Abercrombie Cannonade Ranch near Gonzales, Texas. The ranch, which was loaned to the 1984 Olympic boxing team, is a spartan place with a three-mile running course, a gym and a converted bunkhouse that sleeps 13. The fighters eat with the cowboys.

Abercrombie's programs are financial as well as physical. She recently set up a \$2 million investment plan for her fighters that they help control. The fighters can live

rent-free in a 20-unit apartment building. She also provides health-care insurance, profit sharing and other benefits not usually associated with sweat scientists. Says HBA middleweight and 1984 Olympic gold medalist Frank Tate, "She takes care of us. Like a second mother."

There is no doubt at all that Abercrombie's enthusiasm for boxing is pure. She knows the sport imperfectly, but well enough to realize it is "a dirty game that needs cleaning." What's more, she loves everything that is right with it, "the competition, the chance to be better, the art of it all." To explain why she bothered investing her time and "about \$1 million up front," Abercrombie has a kind of sanitized version she tells. It is like an oral press kit and goes like this:

"I went to see the Larry Holmes-Gerry Cooney fight on closed circuit at the Summit. Most of the people were there for the event of it, but I was really interested and wanted to talk boxing. I got to talking with Bob Spagnola, who'd been an amateur fighter and was working as an accountant for Pennzoil, and he said, 'You seem to know what you're looking at.' I said I did, but that no one would take me to the fights. He said, 'I will, I'll take you around to the gyms and introduce you to some of the fighters and the trainers. Would you like that?' I said I'd adore it, and we began an odyssey of the gyms and fights in Houston."

She had seen real fights and real fighters before. She had seen Sugar Ray Robinson in his purple Cadillac in the south of France, and she had even been in the same room with Sonny Liston. With Spagnola her education went from sentimental to empirical. The gym they hung around most was Willie Savannah's place, an overheated boxing barn with dust in the corners and all the stink you could ask for. At night they went to every fight they could. "They were real kicker joints personified," says Spagnola. "Cowboy and truck driver places. I'd tell Josephine who I thought would win, and she'd say, 'I love the one with muscles.'" Abercrombie was hooked. Of course, when she told her family and society friends about her boxing plans, they were unmused. Her sons were against it. One friend said, "Josephine, you are out of your mind to get involved with those people."

Undaunted, Abercrombie and Savannah made plans. They talked about going into business together and putting up a new gym. She would finance it, and Savannah would run the show. The building went up, all gleaming and odor-free. Alas, the deal fell through. "But I didn't care," she says. "It was too late to quit. I figured I was at the dance and I'm gonna dance." HBA was born.

Simple as that. It is a nice, impulsive story, the sort of tale any tycoon might tell by way of describing the quick purchase of a hockey team, a newspaper or a Pacific island.

And yet there is much more to it. Boxing was a wealthy woman's way of forgetting a sorrow and finding something thrilling and consuming to do.

Marriage had been a series of struggles. Her name changed as often as most highway diners. After graduation from Rice University in 1946, she went through husbands with a disconcerting speed. First came Dick Hudson, a Houston boy. That lasted a year. Then came an Argentine architect (Fernando Segura, 18 months), a Kentucky horseman (Burnett Robinson, six years), and another Kentucky horseman (Barry Ryan, one

year). Four husbands and counting. "I always thought it would be better, and every time I was wrong," she says. Abercrombie thought she finally had it right when she married Tony Bryan, a Harvard-educated executive with the Monsanto Chemical Corporation. In the first 10 years of the marriage, Abercrombie followed her husband up the corporate ladder in perfect lockstep, first to Akron, then on to St. Louis. Never mind that she was one of the wealthiest women in the country and that they could have stayed home in Houston clipping coupons. She was "deliriously" happy with her life, her friends, her marriage. Akron was fine, and so was St. Louis. When her father's health deteriorated badly in 1973, Abercrombie and Bryan moved back to Houston to help run the business. Back at home they were the sort of couple you see in society pages, glimmering folks in black tie and ball gown at this charity ball and that company testimonial.

In 1975, the same year that both her father and mother died, Abercrombie discovered her husband was having an affair with Pam Sakowitz, the wife of retailer Robert Sakowitz. Bryan wanted out. The press coverage was bitchy, and the divorce was worse, with the attendant nastiness over Abercrombie's \$100 million fortune. Abercrombie tells this story while flying on her plane from Houston to New York for the Tim Witherspoon-Bonecrusher Smith WBA heavyweight title fight. Partly to make her guest feel comfortable, partly to keep herself composed, she tries to brush it all off with that precious sort of irony she has.

"That was not a wonderful time of my life, I must say."

Not wonderful? Not wonderful? After a few moments of letting the jet engines fill in the silence, she lets the facade fall away. "I'd raised his kids for 13 years and my own children, too, so there were five of us. He'd become a vice-president of Monsanto's international division. I was perfectly happy as a corporate wife. That's what I was."

"When he decided to leave the marriage I was devastated. I'd adored the whole life I was living, and now this. It really negated all the feelings I had about myself as a wife and a mother."

Abercrombie began seeing a therapist, working harder than usual at the family business and running mile after mile along the streets of River Oaks. She needed something more to do. In the real world of real salaries and real options, a 60-year-old woman does not have many options. An heiress's choices are wider, weirder, Josephine Abercrombie rid herself of all thoughts of marriage and the other traditional paths of Miss Lillie's "woman's world" and got into the fight game. "I ought to write Pam Sakowitz a thank-you note," she told *The House Post*. "I like my life now and I love what I do. The only thing I regret now is that this whole change didn't come earlier."

It's not that everything is perfect. There are times when the place is so big, and her businesses seem so big, that she gets restless at night. To help her sleep she plays "sleep tapes" that murmur to her: "If you have on any tight clothes, take them off." That is all the pillow talk she wants. Josephine Abercrombie has given up marriage for "the manly art."

In New York, Abercrombie stays with her friend Pat Beavers, who owns the Surf Club and the Zulu Lounge, a couple of East Side cabarets where the graduates of Phillips

Exeter and other prep outlets flail their flaxen hair. The apartment is very Fifth Avenue, of course, with a hall the length of a bowling alley and rooms the size of airplane hangars. "Excuse the mess," Pat says, pointing to an immaculate room, "but I'm still a little out of sorts, you see." Pat is just back from the island of Tonga, where she had an absolutely faaaa'bu-lous time. Very unspoiled, you see. And the food? Scrumptious. "It was just perfect." You see she was able to catch up with her son who is sailing around the world and . . .

Josephine is in a guest room, changing. She changes quite a lot. For the evening's fight she has decided to go with a sweater and a tight blue leather miniskirt. Once a day, it seems, someone compliments her on her legs, and she features them rather more than the average 60-year-old. "She's so gorgeous it's disgusting," Pat says.

One of Pat's sons comes in from jogging and says, "Hey, Mom, why don't you go to the fight tonight with Josephine? You can sit upstairs with the poor folks."

There is a bit of chuckling over this undarable remark, but Pat says, "I'll pass."

Most of Abercrombie's high-polish friends have passed, too. Those who were interested remember well the first fighter to walk through the doors of the Houston Boxing Association, the inglorious Cedric Rose.

"Cedric was some piece of work. I loved him, we all did, but he was so bad," says Abercrombie. "Oh, he was such a troublemaker, I cannot tell you! He used to come over and have breakfast with me after he worked out, and we'd talk about everything. He'd tell me his troubles. He was the most appealing kid you'd ever want to know. He fought like a tiger and won all his fights, but he wouldn't do what he was supposed to do. He thought he could do whatever he wanted and still win. We just couldn't get him to come to the gym. He'd stay out all night. He'd take out girls and leave them in the middle of the highway. You just can't believe all the stuff Cedric did."

Spagnola finally told Rose, My-way-or-the-highway, and Rose took off. In Dallas he tried to rob a convenience store. He was armed. The initial sentence was suspended, but after a series of parole violations Rose was finally shipped off to state prison in Huntsville, Texas.

Abercrombie visited Rose there last summer, an experience that jogged her normally right-wing political sensibilities. "It's just terrible, the way they live!" Rose has been in solitary confinement for various violations, and in her letters to him, Abercrombie says, "I tell Cedric to behave himself better in there. . . . I don't really believe that deep down Cedric is bad. He's just, well, not brilliant. He was just a street kid with knives and guns around since he was a little kid."

Fortunately a few less erratic fighters came to the HBA door, Frank Tate the most prominent among them. The "shows," as Abercrombie calls them, have not exactly taken Houston by storm. "We took some terrible baths in the beginning. We must have lost \$1.5 million." The very first of her shows was at the Astroarena, and it was a near disaster. Abercrombie called Arum and asked him to set her up with some "first-class fighters." Arum's traveling pugs were low rent, it turned out, and the evening's entertainment was low comedy. "It was a valuable, and not too costly, lesson," Abercrombie says. "I was taken advantage of, and properly." She immediately hired a matchmaker.

Once at Madison Square Garden, Abercrombie is among her colleagues in promotion. They all extol her: Mickey Duff ("a great, honest broad"), Shelly Finkel ("an honest lady") and Don King ("She's adorable not only in her feminine loveliness but also in her business acumen. One minority to another, I love her"). Arum, for his part, calls her "a Houston lady. She hasn't taken the gloves off yet."

In one of the Garden's clubs, Abercrombie stands between Mike Tyson, whose brutish neck seems thicker than Abercrombie's waist, and the novelist Joyce Carol Oates, who is as ethereal as Olive Oyl. Oates was once overheard at a party in Princeton saying that she had published "as much as Dickens." Part of her recent concerns have been with the ring. She and Tyson are pals.

"Are you Joyce Carol Oates?" says Abercrombie. "I just love your books."

"Oh! Thank you very much."

"Yes, I just read one. Yes, I can't remember the . . ."

"And what do you do?"

"I'm in boxing."

"Promoter or manager?"

"Well," Abercrombie says bashfully, "both, actually."

Oates and a few others less tangentially related to the punching business chat with Abercrombie about her fighters. But the truth is that while her peers are polite, if a bit patronizing about her, they do not see her as much of a threat. They say that for all her resources, Abercrombie has not yet made any significant mark as a promoter and that her hired manager, Bob Spagnola, doesn't know the sport much better than his boss. Most of her shows have been small time, and her best financial prospects, heavyweight Tony Tucker, middleweight Tate and junior welterweight Joe Manley are not exactly setting the world ablaze. "I like Josephine, understand, but with all her millions, she's gone nowhere," says Willie Savannah. "Her organization needs revamping, 'cause she's just spinning her wheels."

"The problem is, she's got to make a decision," says Arum. "To be a promoter or a manager. Unless you're a crook, you've got to do one or the other. With King, he does both to screw the fighter. With Josephine, she leans over the other way. She should manage and negotiate with independent promoters," which would be dandy, of course, for Arum.

Abercrombie "dearly hopes" that Tucker has a chance someday, somewhere, to dethrone at least one of the 57 existing world heavyweight champions. As she sits ringside watching the one-round Witherspoon-Smith fiasco her face fairly glows with the idea that after winning blue ribbons on a horse in the Garden as a girl, she may one day stand here next to a sweaty, pulpy champion whom she can call, with all due respect, her own.

In Houston she is still watching bouts between, say, a kid fresh out of a trailer park and weak puncher known as the Fighting Hairdresser. In Atlantic City, she waits patiently as the ring announcer boasts that "Joe Frazier's nephew is here tonight! They call him Tyrone (Puff of Smoke) Frazier!"

So why does she persist? She has skied down mountains, ridden the fastest horses, flashed through marriages, happy and not. She has been just about every place she could ever want to go. What she wants now is the concentrated, thrilling night that, once in a long while, boxing can provide. She wants to be at the center of a night like the one when Joe Louis decked his man

before Miss Lillie could settle her skirts, a night when every eye is turned toward two men in a crucible of violence and will. She wants the knowledge that she has done right by her fighters and right by the sport. She wants the Big Night.

"I love the fighters and the competition," she says. "I love fur coats on a hot day, funny hats on strange people, purple dresses, big, gold jewelry, the whole weird, strange life of the boxing world. I love it all. It's adorable."

AUDIT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a bill, H.R. 96 which will require the General Accounting Office to conduct a complete and thorough audit of the Federal Reserve System and banks. This bill provides that: The Comptroller General shall make an audit for each fiscal year of the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Advisory Council, the Federal Open Market Committee, and all Federal Reserve banks and their branches, including transactions of the System's open market account conducted through recognized dealers. The bill further provides that the General Accounting Office shall be able to review all books and records of the Federal Reserve. Access to the results of such an audit will give Congress some power to oversee the policies of the Fed.

Such an audit of the Federal Reserve is necessary when one considers that the Federal Reserve, the FDIC, and the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency "are empowered to carry out functions crucial to our system of government and to our Nation's economy." Yet amazingly enough, Congress enacted a law that prevents the GAO from auditing these vital entities of our National Government. The ramifications of this secrecy take on greater significance when one considers that the Monetary Control Act allows the Federal Reserve to purchase paper obligations of foreign governments and use them as collateral for Federal Reserve notes. In stating a reason for excluding these crucial functions from the purview of the GAO audit, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs wrote in 1978: The Federal Reserve [Fed] must be able to independently conduct the Nation's monetary policy.

The Fed, unfortunately, has abused its independence. Paul Craig Roberts, an economist at Georgetown University, argues that the Fed used its power to thwart the economic policies of the Reagan administration during 1981-82. His study provides a good example of Fed independence.

According to Professor Roberts, in late 1980 and early 1981 when the new administration was putting together its economic policy, there was an almost universal consensus that little could be done to get inflation quickly under control. The administration sought to deal with the economic situation by providing moderate, stable, and predictable monetary growth that would first stabilize the

inflation rate and gradually bring it down. The administration also enacted tax policies which would contribute to lower real interest rates and increase private sector savings. These policies were also to be coupled with cuts in Federal spending. Ultimately, Reagan wanted to promote long term economic growth and stability.

But the Federal Reserve did not provide the moderate, stable, and predictable monetary growth desired by the Reagan administration. The Fed believed that Reagan's economic policies would cause inflation and that the Fed would ultimately be blamed. In response, the Fed greatly reduced the supply of money. During 1981 alone, the Fed produced 75 percent of the total reduction in monetary growth that the administration had intended to be spread over a 6-year period.

The policies of the Fed did bring down inflation. But the price was high. Millions of individuals lost their jobs as the country suffered from the worst recession since the Great Depression. An elected administration saw its policies subverted by an independent, unelected body.

The Fed, moreover, also seems to dabble in partisan politics. It has some influence over the outcome of various Presidential elections. One could easily select the earlier campaigns of Johnson, Nixon, and Ford, but I will use the Carter-Reagan contest as an example.

In May 1980, when it was becoming clear that Reagan would be the nominee of the Republican Party, the Federal Reserve Board began a 6-month expansion of the money supply that was almost unprecedented in our history. During the last 6 months of the year, M_{1b} increased \$25.8 billion, or 13.4 percent. The increase prior to the election was, in fact, greater. The Fed increased the money supply by almost \$39 billion before scaling back in December, after the Presidential election was over.

The Fed pursued such an expansionary policy because it feared that a tight monetary policy might defeat President Carter. Such partisan behavior came at a high price, forcing the country to contend with record setting interest rates.

Despite such behavior, supporters of the Fed continue to argue in favor of its independence. They believe that the Central Government cannot be trusted to follow an anti-inflationary policy. Elected officials are prone to pursue a loose monetary policy which will create high rates of economic growth over the short run. But 2 or 3 years later, when the administration is out of office, inflation will take off. Only an impartial agency, isolated from politics can be trusted to serve the financial interests of the country.

There is some merit to this argument. But the Fed has not operated without some political bias. And even though elected officials certainly have been known to act in their own self-interest, they are at least accountable to the people.

When the Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they explicitly gave Congress the "power to coin money and regulate the value thereof." They believed that of the three branches of government, only Congress was close enough to the people to be given this power. But Congress relinquished its power

when it created the Fed in 1913. The central bank was given power to regulate banks and control the supplies of money and credit and it was given the independence thought to be appropriate for a regulatory agency. There was no general understanding at that time of the importance of using money and credit to stabilize the economy. The immense power of the Fed derived more from accident than design. Congress, therefore, is fully justified in trying to regain some control over monetary policy.

Supporters of the status quo also argue that the Fed abides by the broad objectives of the White House and is therefore held in check. In the 1950's, the policies of the Fed reflected the anti-inflationary orientation of Eisenhower. In the 1960's, it accommodated the Kennedy-Johnson expansion. In the 1970's, it vacillated between fighting inflation and recession. And, in the 1980's, it followed Reagan's lead and fought inflation.

At times the Fed may indeed follow the wishes of the President. But the Founding Fathers gave Congress, and not the Executive, power over the purse. By allowing the GAO to audit the Fed, we will finally be able to piece together how it makes its decisions. This will make the Fed more accountable to Congress. Since Congress is an elected body, such oversight will ultimately serve the goals of representative government. It is high time that the people be given an increased say in matters which affect their very well being.

FILIPINO WORLD WAR II VETERANS

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am re-introducing a bill which enjoys bipartisan support to provide relief to certain Filipino war veterans. A similar measure was introduced by Senator INOUE in the Senate.

This measure addresses a problem facing roughly 1,600 Filipino World War II veterans who reside in California and an unknown number throughout the country. Under sections 701 and 702 of the 1940 Nationality Act as were in effect before December 24, 1952, Congress allowed noncitizens who had served honorably in the Armed Forces during World War II to petition for naturalization. A 2-year eligibility period from January 1945 to December 31, 1946, was established under these provisions. While this act was fully carried out in other qualifying areas of the world, it was not the case in the Philippines. Our then Attorney General did not provide for an examiner to receive petitions from the Filipino soldiers for a period of 9 months. As a result, we now have Filipino veterans who could not petition by the deadline seeking the benefits of this act for four decades.

In a U.S. Supreme Court case *INS v. Mendoza* (No. 82-849), a veteran claimed that due to the unavailability of an examiner in the Philippines for 9 months, the Justice Department cannot deny his petition for naturalization under the 1940 act. The high court ruled, how-

ever, that the Justice Department was not estopped by improper implementation from challenging each petition legally. Therefore, for every Filipino veteran who petitions for naturalization under this law, the Justice Department could deny and deport. Moreover, the Justice Department now finds itself confronted with numerous lawsuits filed by Filipino veterans to recover a right Congress granted them.

These individuals now stand a chance of losing their long quest for citizenship that we offered for their bravery in our struggle to maintain peace and security. In addition, these veterans are near or are at retirement age with well established families in the United States. To hold a threat of being deported from a country they have called home for years, and being separated from families they have labored to maintain is purely unjust.

My bill seeks to restore the benefit offered under the 1940 act by extending the filing deadline for 180 days. During the 98th and 99th Congresses, I attempted to add the same measure on to the Immigration Reform Act(s) only to fall short of floor consideration. It is my hope that this historical Congress will mark an end of this 40-year-old struggle.

For the information of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting following my remarks a copy of the analysis of this bill provided by the Justice Department. Let me add as well that the Department supports the passage of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to consider supporting my proposal, and I hope that this body as a whole will move for its adoption.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC, August 28, 1986.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 1302, a bill to permit the naturalization of certain Filipino war veterans. For the reasons set forth below, this Department recommends enactment of this legislation, with one revision.

The bill would permit the naturalization of certain nationals of the Philippines who might previously have qualified for naturalization under the provisions of Title III of the Nationality Act of 1940, as in effect before December 24, 1952. Under Sections 701 and 702 of that Act, non-citizens who had served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II could petition for naturalization. A petition had to be filed no later than December 31, 1946.

For some time following the expiration of the time limit established by Congress for claiming naturalization, it appeared that few persons were interested in asserting any claim to naturalization under this provision. However, in 1967, a Filipino veteran filed suit, claiming that the U.S. Government was estopped from denying this petition for naturalization because it had engaged in affirmative misconduct. The government action attacked by the veteran was the revocation, in 1945, of the authority granted to a vice-consul in the Philippines to confer naturalization benefits, and the decision to not assign a naturalization officer in his place until August 1946. This action was taken pursuant to a request by the newly independent Philippine Government, which had

been concerned that naturalized Filipino veterans were leaving the Philippines immediately upon naturalization. The Supreme Court held that the Government had not engaged in affirmative misconduct, and that the veteran was not entitled to naturalization. *INS v. Hibi*, 414 U.S. 5 (1973).

Since that time, numerous lawsuits have been filed on various theories, all claiming that Philippine veterans previously eligible under the terms of the Act of 1940 are entitled to naturalization. These suits have been filed on behalf of veterans in the United States and in the Philippines. In the major lawsuit on this subject, three categories of veterans were established by the court, with varying levels of claims recognized.¹ *Matter of Naturalization of 68 Filipino War Veterans*, 406 F. Supp. 931 (N.D. Cal. 1975). The claims were based on the court's finding that "constructive" filing of petitions had occurred where the veteran had applied or made efforts to apply, or where the veteran would have applied if the naturalization officer had not been withdrawn. Since that time, other lawsuits based on 68 Filipino War Veterans, supra, have been tried. A substantial number of cases is being held in abeyance, pending the outcome of a second category case on appeal. The Ninth Circuit ruled against the Government on this appeal. *Pangilinan, et al., v. INS*, No. 80-4543 (9th Cir., August 11, 1980).

In addition, the Chief Judge of the Central District of California issued an *ex parte* order to his clerk ordering him to accept filing by all veterans, in and outside the United States, an order which we consider highly improper.

The situation we are faced with, almost forty years after the expiration of the naturalization provision, is an unceasing stream of litigation by veterans claiming naturalization. It is clearly in the Government's interest to put this matter to rest.

The bill in question could go far toward resolving this issue, as well as affording naturalization to certain persons who may have been unable to apply for naturalization because of the agreement made between the Governments of the United States and the Philippines. Congress previously recognized the contribution made by the Filipino veterans during World War II, and is clearly free once more to provide the privilege of naturalization in recognition of that service.

This bill would allow Filipino national veterans within the United States, present both on the date of enactment and on the date of filing of the application for naturalization, to become naturalized citizens. The veterans must have been eligible for naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, but have failed to file a petition for naturalization before January 1, 1947. The application must be filed no later than 90 days after enactment of the bill.

The Department believes that paragraph (3) should be revised to extend the filing time from 90 to 180 days. This will insure that no eligible veteran misses the opportunity to file an application.

¹ Judge Renfrew divided the claimants as follows: I. applicants who established qualifying time in the United States Armed Forces and who did all they could in 1945 and 1946 to become naturalized under Section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940; II. applicants who established qualifying military time in the United States Armed Forces but who did not attempt to naturalize before December 31, 1946, the termination date of Section 702; and III. applicants who were unable to establish they served in a qualifying branch of the United States Armed Forces.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised this Department that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BOLTON,
Assistant Attorney General.

CRISIS CENTER VOLUNTEERS GIVE THEIR ALL FOR COMMUNITY

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the spirit of volunteerism and compassion for others is an important part of our national character, particularly among the people of Jefferson County, AL, whom I am privileged to represent in this great body. Nowhere is that spirit exhibited more than among the 150 volunteers who help provide counseling for a broad spectrum of human concerns and problems at the Crisis Center of Jefferson County.

The crisis center, founded in 1970, ran on a shoestring budget for the first 3 years of its existence, and in 1973 became a United Way agency with eight paid staff members, relying on funding from the United Way as well as grants and contributions. The center's services include a special kid's help line to address the special needs and problems of youth, crisis intervention for rape victims, a community education outreach program that provides the community with a speaker's bureau, films, tapes and literature on current community concerns, and a 24-hour hot line that provides immediate counseling to help those with a problem they can't handle alone.

In 1985, the center answered 21,174 calls (an average of 58 per day), of which 1,842 were potential suicides and 1,778 were categorized as "everyday problems in living." The largest category was "interpersonal," with 6,419 calls received, most of them about marriage, courtship and family relations.

Volunteer phone counselors represent a cross-section of the community, all caring people whose main concern is helping others. Counselor trainees are selected from applicants after interviewing and given a basic training course that includes 60 hours of lecture and closely supervised work. A counselor is expected to work 12 hours each month on a telephone shift, and is asked to make a commitment to work a regular shift for at least a year.

On Friday, February 27, 1987, the crisis center is holding a banquet to honor the 150 volunteers who so selflessly and generously give of their time and experience to offer sound advice, a reason for living, or perhaps, just a sympathetic ear to the thousands who call 323-7777. While all of the volunteers at the center are truly deserving of our highest praise and admiration, the center has selected 19 individuals to receive special awards for their significant volunteer contributions. Those volunteers include Mary Orr, Alice Hawk, Zelda Barnes, Sylvia Darnell, Thelma Green,

Susan Click, Dave Howell, Valerie Howell, Christine McNeill, Melba Thorne, Myra Odess, Elizabeth McDonald, Donna Jennings, Carole Staats, Bertha Randall, Jerome Cooper, Charlotte Ives, Sharon Turner, and Velma Denson.

I am sure my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating these 19 for being singled out for their significant contributions as volunteers, as well as all of the individuals who have helped make the Crisis Center of Jefferson County the great success it has become. I can think of few people who are more deserving of recognition than those who make unique and significant contributions to their communities, not for monetary or personal gain, but just because they care.

RELIEF FOR THE HOMELESS

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1987, President Reagan signed into law emergency relief legislation for the homeless; \$50 million will be immediately spent to bring relief to some of our Nation's most needy citizens.

While I applaud this effort and am pleased that such quick action was taken by Congress and the White House, I cannot ignore the historic irony of the White House support of this effort.

Prior to my 1970 election to Congress, I served on the Berkeley City Council, before that I was a psychiatric social worker in Berkeley. My own personal involvement with homeless people and in particular the homeless mentally ill began during the years when Ronald Reagan was Governor of California. I recall with clarity my astonishment at the callous way the Reagan administration addressed the problems of homelessness in the mid-1960's in California. As in many States, the California State hospitals were overcrowded and understaffed. Community mental health was still years away, and the widespread use of antipsychotic drugs was in its infancy. At a top level statewide meeting with Governor Reagan, the plight of California's public mental health patients was discussed. To the amazement of all present, Governor Reagan said that California public mental health institutions were not understaffed, but were in fact overcrowded. At first, Mr. Speaker, we thought Governor Reagan was playing with words and would eventually see the absurdity of his thoughts. Instead it was discovered that he meant exactly what he said. Before long the streets of Berkeley, Oakland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles became the haven for the mentally ill who had been deinstitutionalized from California State hospitals. Please remember, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the emptying of hospitals before community mental health centers were constructed. The time was 1966-67 and we were at a loss to know what to do about the homeless mentally ill.

When I came to Congress in 1970, I pledged to do all I could to bring some relief to the Nation's homeless in general and the

homeless mentally ill in particular. As a member of the committee I now chair, the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have worked to build a national awareness of this problem by focusing on the plight of the homeless who reside in our Nation's Capital and sleep on grates within sight of the White House. In 1975, our colleague WALTER FAUNTROY and I along with then committee chair, Charles Diggs, investigated the way in which the Federal Government was treating the mentally ill at St. Elizabeths Hospital. We were appalled to find that no plan existed for the aftercare of deinstitutionalized St. Elizabeths patients. In 1979, after becoming chair of the District of Columbia Committee, I chaired 7 days of hearings on the problems facing the urban centers of our Nation. In 1980 and 1981, I directed committee staff to begin a long-range investigation of the practice of the deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill. With the support of the ranking Republican member of the District of Columbia Committee, STEWART MCKINNEY, study was conducted into the appropriateness of the mass emptying of our Nation's State mental health institutions. Three days' of hearings were held during which expert witnesses confirmed what our staff investigation had uncovered, that the national phenomenon of deinstitutionalizing the mentally ill was becoming the major contributor to the increases of homeless and street population. That was 6 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

Today 40-60 percent of the people who wander our streets are seriously mentally ill and the majority have been deinstitutionalized without regard to their state of mind or future.

We now have before us legislation, which I support, that would release \$500 million to assist States in addressing this national tragedy that has gone on for far too long. For some of us, Mr. Speaker, 20 years is long enough, surely we can do better.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to alleviate the continuing problems created by anticompetitive and anticonsumer warranties contained in the Clean Air Act.

First, it would limit the production and performance warranties on emission systems to 2 years/24,000 miles and make sure the list of parts covered is not subsequently expanded. It would specifically limit the 2 year/24,000 mile warranty to the catalytic converter, the thermal reactor, and parts solely used for emissions control. EPA would retain the right to recall emission system failures for 5 years/50,000 miles. Second, it further increases competition by repealing the counterproductive parts certification program and by doing away with the waiver that allows auto manufacturers to specify the use of one of their own parts. Third, it permits independent California auto parts dealers and repair shops to

operate under the same warranty requirements that apply in other States. And finally, it clarifies the antitampering provisions of the law.

In 1977, Congress amended the Clean Air Act to protect the small businessman and the consumer from anticompetitive emissions warranties. Parts to be warranted for the extended period were limited to those that are installed primarily to control emissions.

EPA expanded the list of parts covered by the warranty through regulations. The Automotive Service Industry Association [ASIA] and the Automotive Parts Rebuilders Association [APRA] filed suit in 1980 asserting that the regulations were contrary to the Clean Air Act as amended in 1977. In a separate action, vehicle manufacturers and importers filed suit on the warranty and certification matters and included a legal objection to the short test regulations issued by EPA. The court ordered consolidation of the cases, forcing joint consideration of aftermarket and vehicle manufacturer issues.

Prior to final court arguments, ASIA and APRA presented to EPA a technical report by Packer Engineering which analyzed the specific parts under consideration, the particular performance objectives of such parts and the historical nature of their use. Based on this report and other information supplied to EPA by ASIA and APRA, a tentative consensus was reached which would have substantially limited the parts subject to the extended 5 year/50,000 mile performance warranty.

The court recognized that Congress did in fact act to reduce the anticompetitive effects of a broad coverage/long length warranty in 1977. However, it accepted the EPA interpretation that the warranty coverage for the first 2 years/24,000 miles was for all components affecting emissions. With respect to coverage after 2 years/24,000 miles, the court avoided a direct decision on the correctness of the parts list issued by EPA. The court stated that the parts list was advisory only and therefore not subject to attack.

The court did not disturb the liberties taken by EPA in misinterpreting the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act. EPA regulations provide that not only sole or primary parts must be warranted, but also secondary parts which fail because of a failed primary part. The court's decision on the certification issues transformed a congressional edict to provide a program to avoid monopoly into one which actually creates an anticompetitive situation which is worse than what would have occurred if no such program had been instituted.

EPA regulations provide that an aftermarket manufacturer who certified parts is liable for all costs incurred by a vehicle manufacturer caused by the failure of that certified part. Certifiers must, as a condition of certification, agree to such a reimbursement scheme.

Under the proposed regulations, to avoid warranty repair obligations where an uncertified part has been used, the vehicle manufacturer need only "demonstrate" that the defect or damage to the vehicle's emission control system was caused by the uncertified part. The vehicle manufacturer would provide the consumer with a written copy of his technical argument and warranty denial and list objec-

tive evidence upon which his decision is based. The denial must show a causal connection between the use of the part and test failure and contain an assertion that removal of the uncertified part and replacement with an OEM part would resolve the problem or that use of that part caused damage to other parts which must be replaced to resolve the problem.

This would then put the consumer into the unenviable position of fighting the vehicle manufacturer on their turf and under their rules. The result is only too clear. The aftermarket parts manufacturer has no choice. He can certify and take on immense financial obligations and the prospect of unending legal battles with the vehicle manufacturer over which part caused damage, or, the aftermarket parts manufacturer can decline to certify and his customers, the consuming public that has overwhelmingly chosen to use independent aftermarket parts when their choice was free, would now face the task of reversing a decision of the vehicle manufacturer, a reversal which would not be in the best interest of the vehicle manufacturer. There is no question but that EPA implementation of the long length, broad based emissions warranty, has, contrary to congressional intent, sealed the hood of the vehicle and destroyed consumer freedom to choice. Now, the newly promulgated EPA self-certification regulations, again contrary to congressional intent, continue toward the relentless goal of the agency to seal the hood of the vehicle.

All administrative and legal remedies available to the independent aftermarket has now been pursued. Corrective legislation to put competition back into the law is needed. Such legislation must clearly remove the power of EPA to twist the intent of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this is an ever growing problem and, from what southern California independent garages have shown me, it amounts to an extensive loss of business. In the 97th Congress I introduced two bills dealing with this subject and one of them was almost completely incorporated into H.R. 5252, the comprehensive Clean Air Bill. Unfortunately, the measure did not become law because of the difficulty in resolving other issues. In the 98th and 99th Congress I introduced a similar measure which I hoped might provide a solution to the problem. For all States, including California, the bill would have reduced the production and performance warranties to 2 years/24,000 miles for all emissions system parts.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with yet another example of good intentions gone astray. All of us want cleaner air but the adverse effects of these warranties on the aftermarket and the consuming public cannot be justified or overlooked. They must be taken into account if we are interested in preserving competition and an important sector of the small business community. The legislation I have introduced today will restore and preserve that competition and, in the long run, provide the best guarantee of protection to consumers.

The concepts of my bill are supported by the Automotive Service Industry Association, the Motor and Equipment Manufacturers Association, the Automotive Parts and Accessories Association, the Automotive Service As-

sociation, the Automotive Warehouse Distributors Association, the National Fire Dealers and Retreaders Association, and the Automotive Parts Rebuilders Association.

The text of the bill is reprinted below:

H.R. 1239

To amend the Clean Air Act to promote competitiveness in the motor vehicle aftermarket and to preserve consumer freedom of choice to select parts and service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Clean Air Act.

Sec. 2. (a)(1) Section 207(a)(1)(42 U.S.C. 7541(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "(A) designed, built, and equipped" and all that follows through the end of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(A) equipped with emission control components (as defined in subsection (b)) designed to enable such vehicle or engine to conform at the time of sale with applicable regulations under section 202, and (B) free from defects in materials and workmanship which cause such vehicle or engine to fail to conform with applicable regulations, for the first two years, or the first twenty-four thousand miles, whichever first occurs."

(2) Section 207(a)(2) is repealed.

(3) Section 207(a) is amended by designating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by striking out "or primary" in the last sentence thereof.

(4) Section 207(b)(2)(B) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) it fails to conform, for a period of use of the first two years, or the first twenty-four thousand miles, whichever first occurs, to the regulations under section 202, and".

(b)(1) Section 207(b)(2) is amended by striking out "the emission control device or system" and inserting in lieu thereof "the emission control component".

(2) Section 207(b) is amended by striking out the last three sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "For purposes of the warranty under subsection (a)(1) and paragraph (2), the term 'emission control component' means only a catalytic converter, thermal reactor, or other component installed on or in a vehicle for the sole purpose of reducing vehicle emissions. Such term shall not include vehicle components which were in general use prior to model year 1968."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 207(c)(3)(A) is amended in the first sentence by striking out "and such instructions shall correspond to regulations which the Administrator shall promulgate" and in the second sentence by striking out "which has been certified as provided in subsection (a)(2)".

(b) Section 207(c)(3)(B) is amended by striking out "except that the prohibition" and all that follows down to the period at the end thereof.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall take effect with respect to model years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 4. Section 209(b) (42 U.S.C. 7543(b)) is amended (1) by inserting "(other than paragraph (4))" after "application of this section" in paragraph (1), and (2) by adding after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) No State may, after a reasonable time as determined by the Administrator following the date of the enactment of this paragraph, establish or enforce a warranty or prescribed maintenance requirement for new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines unless such warranty or prescribed maintenance requirement is identical to the corresponding Federal warranty or prescribed maintenance requirement."

Sec. 5. (a) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 203(a)(3) (42 U.S.C. 7522(a)(3)) are each amended by—

(1) striking out "device or element of design installed on or in a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine" and inserting in lieu thereof "part or component placed in or on a motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine for the sole purpose of controlling emissions"; and

(2) inserting the following before the semicolon at the end thereof "except as may be necessary in connection with routine maintenance".

(b) Subparagraph (A) of such section is amended by striking out "such device or element of design" and inserting in lieu thereof "such part or component".

Sec. 6. Section 177 (42 U.S.C. 7507) is amended by inserting "(which shall not include any provision similar to subsection (a) or (b) of section 207)" before "relating to control of emissions".

Sec. 7. (a) Section 207(g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) For the purposes of this section, the owner of any motor vehicle or motor vehicle engine warranted under this section is responsible in the proper maintenance of such vehicle or engine to replace and to maintain, at his expense and at any service establishment or facility of his choosing, such items as spark plugs, points, condensers, and any other part, item, or device related to emission control, unless such part, item, or device is covered by any warranty not required by this Act."

(b)(1) Section 203(a)(4)(C) is amended by striking out "except as provided in subsection (c)(3) of section 207."

(2) Section 203(a)(4) is amended by inserting immediately after subparagraph (D): "Subparagraph (C) shall not apply to the provision of any communication regarding any part, component, or system, or service provided without charge under the terms of the purchase agreement."

THE NATIONAL PRESERVATION HISTORIC FUND

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this year we are celebrating the bicentennial of our Constitution, yet many historic landmarks which were standing before our Constitution was written will not see the dawn of the next century.

For the past 6 years, President Reagan has submitted a budget to Congress which has requested zero funding for the Historic Preservation Fund. The Historic Preservation Fund is a State/Federal partnership which was established by an act of Congress in 1966. Through the fund, with matching funds provided by States, local governments, nonprofit corpora-

tions, and private donations, State historic preservation offices were established in all 50 States and the trust territories.

These State Historic Preservation offices conduct detailed reviews of applications for Federal investment tax credits for restoration projects. They consult with Federal agencies on how federally funded or licensed projects affect cultural resources. They identify significant historic sites. They assist the historic preservation efforts of local governments.

In the past, State offices administered an acquisition and development program, funded through the Historic Preservation Fund, which provided matching grants to support the purchase and restoration of significant sites. In the State of New Mexico, two historic mission churches have been lost during the past year because funds were not available. Just this past week, a national historic landmark was purchased by a private party and its future is now uncertain. It is possible that the State could have acquired the site for restoration had the appropriate funds been available.

The New Mexico State Legislature is currently considering two bills which will establish a revolving fund for the preservation of historic buildings. Many other States already have similar funds. The recommended funding for this program will enable our States to preserve significant historical sights that would otherwise be doomed. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the efforts to return the preservation of our Nation's history to its rightful place on the national agenda. We must stand behind our commitment in this Federal/State partnership.

RETURN TO THE GOLD STANDARD

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, if we are to revitalize our Nation's economy, we must remove from Government the temptation and the ability to produce chronic budget deficits. Restoration of a dependable monetary standard based on a commodity with fixed value would, by making monetization impossible, accomplish this. For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 336 a bill to produce that all Federal Reserve notes and other currencies of the United States shall be redeemable in gold.

In the constitutional debates in Philadelphia the monetary standard of the United States was a matter of central consideration. Article I, sections 8, 9, and 10 unequivocally provide for a monetary standard of gold and silver. Not until 1862, in the midst of the Civil War, did America suspend convertibility and begin printing greenbacks. During the Civil War, as a result of the suspension of convertibility, price levels tripled. When Congress decided to return to a gold convertible greenback in 1875 to prevent further increases, prices stabilized and inflation ceased to exist.

In the half century that has passed since President Roosevelt ordered that U.S. citizens would not be able to trade dollars for gold, the purchasing power of the dollar has declined

significantly while the value of gold in real terms has remained almost constant. In 1928, one could purchase a two-door Chevrolet coupe with a rumble seat for \$720 or 36 ounces of gold. Thirty-six ounces of gold today at around \$400 per ounce will buy two fine Ford Escorts. In 1932 one could buy a fine suit of clothes for \$20 or 1 ounce of gold. One ounce of gold will buy you a fine suit today. One ounce of gold in the early Depression years would buy you over 300 gallons of gasoline at the pump, 10 gallons for a dollar. One ounce of gold today—with gasoline at \$1.20 per gallon—will buy you 250 gallons of gasoline. While the gold standard is not perfect, its reinstitution in some form would be an improvement over the fiat paper money in circulation since 1933.

Some economists have argued the gold standard should not and could not be reinstated. Keynesians complain that under the gold standard, the Government would lose control of our money supply. That is precisely the objective of the gold standard: to take control of the money supply, and correspondingly, money value, out of the hands of a few Government decisionmakers. Keynesians contend that the Government must have the authority to adjust money supplies to stimulate demand. Since Roosevelt abandoned the gold standard in 1933, this view has ruled, and ruled miserably. The attempts to "fine tune" "adjust" the money supply to regulate demand have caused wave after wave of inflation. Each wave eclipses the former. These failures have given impetus to the rebirth of the gold standard. Ironically, at the moment that President Richard Nixon proclaimed, "We are all Keynesians," this philosophy was in its death throes. For more than four decades, the Keynesians have had control of the money. They have debauched its value.

They also argue that the gold standard will not restrain all forms of inflation. Inflation can still occur with currency tied to gold owing to a significant increase in supply. Such an inflation did indeed occur during the gold rush in California. But unlike under a fiat money standard, the laws of supply and demand serve to eliminate inflation. As the supply of gold increases, its value decreases and the incentive to mine additional gold diminishes. As less gold is introduced into the market inflation is brought under control.

Keynesians argue further that there is not enough gold to function as money in today's vigorous international trading environment. With the fixed gold redemption rate set at the market price of gold, current paper dollars would not disappear, but simply retain a constant value due to their link to gold. If international trade takes place with gold-backed dollars, it will function more smoothly by eliminating wild currency gyrations. Every contract will not require an inflation clause; every creditor will not have to guess what interest rate he should charge to recover his loan after inflation; every business relationship will not have to be renegotiated periodically due to money value changes; every disposable dollar will not be immediately consumed but saved to create more investment capital. Trade will be encouraged by sound money.

The monetarists seem to have few substantive arguments against the gold standard, they

simply do not have any confidence that it can be implemented. Milton Friedman contends that finding a market price of gold would be impossible. Adopting gold as a monetary standard at current prices, he contends, would cause more uncertainty than tying the currency to pork bellies. This statement overlooks the reason that gold prices have swirled on the commodity market. With the nations of the world depending on fluctuating fiat currencies, no one would really expect any different result for gold commodity prices. Unbacked paper has expanded and shrunk daily as governments have printed more paper to cover their debts and as traders have shifted from currency to currency on the international market seeking an exchange medium that will hold its value. Indeed as popular trust in the idle promises behind paper has risen and fallen and as the number of paper dollars has risen and fallen, so have the prices of gold. The price of gold as a monetary standard would not vary wildly. A dollar would be a fixed measure for a certain number of grains of gold. Without inflation, there would be no risk, speculation, or price fluctuation. The dollar would retain a stable value, as it did for decades before it was severed from gold.

Ultimately, the question is not whether it is possible to reestablish the gold standard or whether it is too difficult to do so. But, the practical question remains: Is it harder to return to a gold standard which worked for over 150 years in America, or is it harder to live with the conditions that have resulted from a reliance on fiat currency, the highest interest rates, the worst inflation, alternating inflation and potential deflation, recessions, and so forth? Not only would a gold-backed dollar bring about monetary stabilization and lower interest rates, but it would also help balance the budget by preventing politicians from overspending and then simply monetizing the debt. It is high time for our currency to once again be as sound as a dollar and the dollar to be as good as gold.

A SALUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives approved a bill designating the week of March 1, 1987, as Federal Employees Recognition Week.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, it was my privilege to bring this bill to the floor. I want to commend the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 53, Ms. OAKAR, for her unwavering efforts in support of Federal employees.

This joint resolution, I believe, will serve an important purpose. It will remind all Americans of the significant role our civil servants play in their everyday lives.

Just think about it for a minute. Federal employees process the millions of Social Security checks that go to our senior citizens every month. They provide health care and counseling to our veterans. They process loans for

small businesses, farmers, college students, and homeowners.

The men and women who safely direct thousands of plane flights a day are Federal employees. Millions of pieces of mail are delivered every day by civil servants.

Federal employees risk their lives to chase down drug smugglers at our borders. They provide detailed weather information to communities throughout the Nation.

The list could go on and on.

So the next time you hear this administration say that Federal employees are underworked and overpaid, stop and think about the numerous contributions Federal workers make to each and every one of us. And remember that, on the average, Federal employees receive less pay and less benefits for their efforts than employees in the private sector.

Then, during the week of March 1, take a minute to thank a Federal employee for his or her work to improve everyday life for all Americans.

THANKS TO CHRISS DOSS FOR A JOB WELL DONE

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 26, 1987, the employees of Jefferson County, AL, whom I am proud to represent in the House, will honor a man who has served his county and State in public office for 16 years.

Chriss Doss in a Cullman County native who received his B.A. degree from Samford University; M.S.L.S. degree from Drexel University; B.D. from Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, and J.D. from Cumberland School of Law, Samford University. He has done postgraduate studies at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in church history, and at Temple University in American Revolution and constitutional history.

Chriss Doss began his career in 1962 as assistant librarian and assistant professor of history at the Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, PA; and was law librarian at Samford University from 1964-67; and for several years he was a partner in the law firm of Doss, Gorham & Natter in Birmingham.

He was elected to the Alabama House of Representatives and served from 1970-74. From 1972-74, he was chairman of the Jefferson County House Delegation. On January 20, 1975, Doss was elected to the Jefferson County Commission as the commissioner of public works where he remained until the special election on March 2, 1982, when he became president of the Jefferson County Commission.

His affiliations are many, including the Birmingham Bar Association, Alabama Bar Association, American Bar Association, American Heritage Society, Southern Historical Association, Alabama Historical Association, and numerous other professional and academic societies and organizations. He has written several articles for professional periodicals on li-

braries, church libraries, and local history. He has served as president of the Association of County Commissions of Alabama and has served on the board of managers of ACCA for the last 8 years. He has also served as president of the Alabama Historical Association and is presently on that organization's executive committee.

From 1982 through 1986, Doss served on the board of directors of the National Association of Counties [NACo]. He also served for several years on NACo's finance and taxation steering committee, and transportation steering committee.

Chriss Doss has held numerous interim pastorates in Baptist churches in Alabama, and is frequently called upon to speak in churches throughout Alabama. He is sought after as a speaker on American, Alabama church, and local history. He is also thought of as an expert in State and local government. He is an avid and enthusiastic reader, who has a personal library of over 9,000 volumes.

He and his wife, Birmingham physician, Dr. Faye Williams Doss, have four children.

Chriss Doss has served his State and county with distinction. It is a testament to his public service that his former employees will gather together to honor him for his years of public work. They are saying, on behalf of those across Jefferson County he served, "Thanks," for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR J. ALFRED SMITH

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable FORTNEY (PETE) STARK and I are extremely pleased to join with thousands of our constituents in and about the city of Oakland, CA, on March 1, 1987, in a singular community tribute and reception on behalf of the esteemed Pastor J. Alfred Smith.

It would be impossible to enumerate the host of honors and awards Pastor Smith has received over the years for his distinguished service to our community. Residents of the Eighth and Ninth California Congressional Districts have been privileged to have the service of this remarkable individual who has received over 75 local and national awards for his leadership in revitalizing the minority business community, reducing drug traffic, promoting youth employment, improving educational opportunity, extending civil rights, expanding health care, and generally enhancing communications across racial, social, and religious lines. Dr. Smith, both educator and minister, served with distinction on the Oakland Board of Education. He was recently elected president of the Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.

As we personally extend our congratulations and best wishes to Pastor Smith, we are delighted to share his remarkable achievements with our colleagues in the U.S. Congress.

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS COVERAGE ACT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the President's catastrophic health insurance legislation. I include, below for my colleagues perusal a copy of the legislation and a factsheet:

FACTSHEET

In his sixth State of the Union address, President Reagan pledged to submit legislation "to help free the elderly from the fear of catastrophic illness." The President said: "... let us remove a financial specter facing our older Americans—the fear of an illness so expensive that it can result in having to make an intolerable choice between bankruptcy and death."

To fulfill that commitment, the President today is sending to Congress the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act. This landmark legislation would provide protection under the Medicare program for elderly and disabled Americans who suffer an acute care catastrophic illness.

As the President states in his transmittal message to the Congress, "The legislation would help provide peace of mind for 30 million Americans without adding to the tax burden of their children."

The six-part "Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act" would provide improved acute care coverage for the elderly and disabled by restructuring the Medicare program as follows:

ANNUAL CEILING ON BENEFICIARY EXPENSES

Under Section 3 of the President's proposed legislation, an annual \$2,000 out-of-pocket limit for Medicare-covered expenses would be established. Each beneficiary would be assured that once he incurred out-of-pocket expenses for approved charges of \$2,000, Medicare would pay for all remaining coverage charges.

Any beneficiary enrolled in the Medicare Supplementary Medical Insurance Program (part B) would be protected by the ceiling. The \$2,000 ceiling for 1988 would be indexed in the future by the percentage change in total Medicare per capita expenses.

Out-of-pocket expenses would include the part A hospital deductible, coinsurance under the hospice benefit, and the part B deductible and coinsurance. Amounts above the Medicare-approved fee level paid to physicians and others who do not accept Medicare assignment would not be included.

MEDICARE HOSPITAL INSURANCE (PART A) PROGRAM

As part of the added protection against catastrophic illness, all hospital and skilled nursing facility coinsurance would be eliminated.

Under Section 2 of the proposed legislation, Medicare would pay for an unlimited number of hospital days for covered services. Skilled nursing facility care would be provided for up to 100 days per year.

The complicated "spell-of-illness" methodology for computing benefits would be eliminated. Instead of the beneficiary paying an inpatient hospital deductible for each spell of illness, a beneficiary would only pay the deductible for the first two inpatient hospital admissions in a year. No beneficiary

would ever pay more than two hospital deductibles in any year.

THE PART B PREMIUM

The President's proposal would be completely financed by a modest addition to the existing monthly Supplementary Medical Insurance (part B) premium. This addition is an actuarially sound premium of \$4.92. Section 4 of the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act would initially increase the part B premium to pay for the costs of the new catastrophic insurance, including changes in the part A program under section 2 and the costs of the annual ceiling set by section 3.

Any beneficiary electing the optional part B would be automatically covered for catastrophic illness expenditures.

The catastrophic expense cap would be adjusted annually to reflect changes in program costs to ensure that the added catastrophic protection remains budget neutral.

Noting in this bill is intended to result in any decrease in the monthly cash benefit paid to an individual, and the Administration will work with the Congress to add a budget-neutral hold-harmless adjustment to Social Security for 1989 and later years.

TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

Section 1 of the proposal would assign the measure the short title "Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act." Section 5 would apply the measure's provisions as of the beginning of calendar year 1988.

CONCLUSION

The Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act addresses a fundamental gap in health insurance protection for the elderly and disabled. The President today urged Congress to pass this legislation and "give elderly Americans a health insurance plan that fights the fear of catastrophic acute care illness."

A bill to provide for Medicare catastrophic illness coverage, and for other purpose

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

SHORT TITLE AND REFERENCES IN ACT

SECTION 1. (a) This Act may be cited as the "Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act".

(b) The amendments in this Act apply to the Social Security Act.

REVISIONS IN HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1812(a) is amended—

(1) by revising paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) inpatient hospital services;" and (2) in paragraph (2), by striking out "spell of illness" and inserting instead "year".

(b) Section 1812(b) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by (A) striking out "spell of illness" and inserting instead "year" and (B) striking out "(subject to subsection (c))";

(2) by striking out paragraph (1),

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking out "spell" each place it occurs and inserting instead "year", and

(4) by renumbering paragraphs (2) and (3) as (1) and (2), respectively.

(c) Section 1812(c) is repealed.

(d) Section 1812(e) is amended by striking out "subsections (b) and (c), inpatient hospital services, inpatient psychiatric hospital services," and inserting instead "subsection (b), inpatient psychiatric services".

(e) Section 1812(g) is amended by striking out "definition of 'spell of illness', and for

definitions of other" and inserting instead "definitions of".

(f) section 1813(a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by striking out "any spell of illness" and inserting instead "each of the first two admissions in a year";

(2) by striking out the second sentence of paragraph (1), and

(3) by striking out paragraph (3).

(g) Section 1813(b)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The inpatient hospital deductible for a year shall apply to the deduction under subsection (a)(1) for the year in which the first day of inpatient services occurs in an admission."

(h) Section 1832(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For definitions of 'medical and other health services' and other terms used in this part, see section 1861."

(i) Section 1861(a) is repealed.

(j) Section 1861(y) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "(except for purposes of subsection (a)(2))";

(2) in paragraph (2), by (A) striking out "spell of illness" each place it occurs and inserting instead "year" and (B) striking out "spell" each place it occurs and inserting instead "year";

(3) by striking out paragraph (3), and

(4) by renumbering paragraph (4) as (3).

(k) Section 1866(a)(2)(A)(i) is amended by striking out "(a)(3), or (a)(4), section 1833(b), or section 1861(y)(3)" and inserting instead "section 1813(a)(4), or section 1833(b)".

CEILING FOR BENEFICIARY EXPENSES

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1832(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1),

(2) by substituting "and" for the period at the end of paragraph (2), and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) entitlement to have payment made to him or on his behalf (subject to the provisions of this part) of the amounts specified in section 1833(a)(5)."

(b) Section 1833(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3),

(2) by substituting "and" for the period at the end of paragraph (4), and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) the amounts by which the beneficiary cost sharing amounts for items and services furnished in a year (but substituting that period of the last quarter of the preceding year that occurs before the cost sharing limitation for that preceding year is reached (if at all) for the last quarter of the year in question, if the amounts are greater) exceed the cost sharing limitation for that year."

(c) The first sentence of section 1833(b) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (3), and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: "and (5) such deductible shall be included in the beneficiary cost sharing amounts".

(d) Section 1833(d) is amended by inserting "(except as provided by subsection (a)(5))" before the period.

(e) Section 1833 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(m) The Secretary shall, during September of 1988 and of each year thereafter, determine and promulgate the cost sharing limitation (as defined in section 1861(a)(2)) for the succeeding calendar year."

(f) Section 1861 (as amended by section 2(i) of this Act) is further amended by inserting before subsection (b) the following:

"(a)(1) The term 'beneficiary cost sharing amounts' means the amounts of expenses that an individual who is covered under the insurance program established by part B incurs that are—

"(A) amounts specified in the first two sentences of section 1866(a)(2)(A) (but for an individual who is not also covered under the insurance program established by part A, only those amounts for items and services covered under part B), and

"(B) amounts equal to the difference between the total amounts that constitute payment in full under part B when a physician or other entity that is not a provider of services accepts (or would accept) assignment (or otherwise agrees to accept a specified amount) and the amounts payable from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for those items and services (other than under section 1833(a)(5))."

"(2) The term 'cost sharing limitation' means—

"(A) for 1988, \$2,000, and

"(B) for 1989 and later years, \$2,000 increased (or decreased) by the percentage increase (or decrease) in total per capita expenses of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for the second preceding year over those for 1986 (but, if not a multiple of \$10, rounded to the nearest multiple, or, if midway between two multiples, rounded to the next higher)."

(g) Section 1866(a)(2)(A) is amended by adding at the end the following: "A provider of services may not impose a charge under this subparagraph to the extent payment is made to the provider of services under section 1832(a)(3)."

INCREASE IN SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE PREMIUM

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1839(a)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1839(a)(1). The Secretary shall, during September of 1987 and of each year thereafter, determine the monthly actuarial basic rate and the monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate for enrollees age 65 and over which shall be applicable for the succeeding calendar year. The monthly actuarial basic rate shall be the amount the Secretary estimates to be necessary so that the aggregate amount for the calendar year with respect to those enrollees age 65 and over will equal one-half of the total of the benefits and administrative costs which he estimates will be payable from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for services performed and related administrative costs incurred in such calendar year with respect to such enrollees (excluding benefits payable under section 1833(a)(5)). The monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate shall be the amount the Secretary estimates to be necessary so that the aggregate amount for the calendar year with respect to those enrollees age 65 and over will equal the total of the benefits and administrative costs which he estimates will be payable from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for services performed and related administrative costs incurred in such calendar year with respect to such enrollees under section 1833(a)(5), and from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for the changes (under section 2 of the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act) in services performed in such calendar year with respect to individuals age 65

and over who are covered under the insurance program established by part A. In calculating the monthly actuarial rates, the Secretary shall include appropriate amounts for a contingency margin."

(b) Section 1839(a)(2) is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting instead "1987".

(c) Section 1839(a)(3) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking out "1983" and inserting instead "1987";

(2) by revising the second sentence to read as follows: "The monthly premium shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (e)) be equal to the sum of—

"(A) a weighted average of the monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate for enrollees age 65 and over, determined according to paragraph (1) of this subsection, and that rate for disabled enrollees under age 65, determined according to paragraph (4) of this subsection, for that calendar year, and

"(B) the smaller of—

"(i) the monthly actuarial basic rate for enrollees age 65 and over, determined according to paragraph (1) of this subsection, for that calendar year, or

"(ii) the monthly payment rate most recently promulgated by the Secretary under this paragraph, increased by a percentage determined as follows: The Secretary shall ascertain the primary insurance amount computed under section 215(a)(1), based upon average indexed monthly earnings of \$900, that applied to individuals who became eligible for and entitled to old-age insurance benefits on November 1 of the year before the year of the promulgation. He shall increase the monthly premium rate by the same percentage by which that primary insurance amount is increased when, by reason of the law in effect at the time the promulgation is made, it is so computed to apply to those individuals for the following November 1," and

(3) in the third sentence, by striking out "amount of an adequate actuarial rate for enrollees age 65 and over as provided in paragraph (1)" and inserting instead "amounts of adequate actuarial basic and catastrophic illness rates for enrollees as provided in paragraphs (1) and (4)".

(d) Section 1839(a)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) The Secretary shall also, during September of 1987 and of each year thereafter, determine the monthly actuarial basic rate and the monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate for disabled enrollees under age 65 which shall be applicable for the succeeding calendar year. The monthly actuarial basic rate shall be the amount the Secretary estimates to be necessary so that the aggregate amount for the calendar year with respect to disabled enrollees under age 65 will equal one-half of the total of the benefits and administrative costs which he estimates will be payable from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for services performed and related administrative costs incurred in such calendar year with respect to such enrollees (excluding benefits payable under section 1833(a)(5)). The monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate shall be the amount the Secretary estimates to be necessary so that the aggregate amount for the calendar year with respect to disabled enrollees under age 65 will equal the total of the benefits and administrative costs which he estimates will be payable from the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for services performed and related administrative costs incurred in such calendar year with respect to such enrollees under section 1833(a)(5), and from the Federal

Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for the changes (under section 2 of the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act) in services performed in such calendar year with respect to disabled individuals under age 65 who are covered under the insurance program established by part A. In calculating the monthly actuarial rates, the Secretary shall include appropriate amounts for a contingency margin."

(e) Section 1839(e)(1) is amended—

(1) by striking out "monthly premium" and inserting instead "portion of the monthly premium otherwise determined under subsection (a)(3)(B)", and

(2) by inserting "basic" after "actuarial".

(f) Section 1839(f)(1) is amended by striking out "1985, 1986, or 1987, the monthly premium" and inserting instead "1987, the portion of the monthly premium otherwise determined under subsection (a)(3)(B)".

(g) Section 1839(f)(2) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by (A) striking out "1986, 1987, or" and (B) striking out "monthly premium" the second place it occurs and inserting instead "portion of the monthly premium otherwise determined under subsection (a)(3)(B)", and

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking out "monthly premium amount determined under subsection (a)(2)" each place it occurs and inserting instead "portion of the monthly premium amount determined under subsection (a)(3)(B)".

(h) Section 1841 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) The portion of the premium amounts that is determined under section 1839(a)(3)(A) shall be treated as a separate account. Amounts paid under section 1832(a)(3) or transferred under subsection (k) of this section shall come from that portion.

"(k) There shall be transferred from time to time from the Trust Fund to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund amounts from the premium under this part that are attributable to the changes (under section 2 of the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act) in services performed in such calendar year with respect to individuals who are covered under the insurance program established by part A."

(i) Section 1844(a)(1)(A)(i) and section 1844(a)(1)(B)(i) are each amended by striking out "twice the dollar amount of the actuarially adequate rate" and inserting instead "the sum of the dollar amount of the actuarially adequate catastrophic illness rate and twice the dollar amount of the actuarially adequate basic rate".

(j) Section 1876(a)(5) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking out "200 percent of", and

(2) in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii), by striking out "monthly actuarial rate" and inserting instead "the sum of the monthly actuarial catastrophic illness rate and twice the monthly actuarial basic rate".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 5. The amendments made by the preceding sections apply to items and services furnished after, and premiums for months after, 1987 (and do not, for purposes of the parenthetical clause in section 1833(a)(5) of the Social Security Act, apply to items and services furnished during the last three months of 1987).

TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1987

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, congressional debate concerning Federal deficit reduction misses a basic, essential fact—accounting methods. Without doubt, an area as important as deficit reduction must be considered carefully, and decisions must be based on reliable financial information. In the absence of such information, we would be making spending decisions without sound financial planning and jeopardizing the future of necessary programs. In fact, this is happening right now.

Currently, the U.S. Government requires no publication of the financial statements of its various entities, and uses the cash basis of accounting for budget reporting. This presents some serious problems. According to one of the world's largest accounting firms, Arthur Andersen & Co., cash-basis accounting "hides the costs of current programs, and results in misinformation and misunderstanding."

Cash-basis accounting keeps track of all the money which an organization receives and pays out. It ignores money which an organization will both earn and owe in the future. It is an accounting method tailored to the needs of small businesses. When applied to a large government, it falls short of providing reliable information needed for sound policymaking decisions and therefore creates a clouded financial picture. A more appropriate alternative to cash-basis accounting is accrual-basis accounting or GAAP.

Applying GAAP [generally accepted accounting procedures] produces a more accurate picture of our Government's financial health. Accrual-based accounting matches expenses with their associated revenues; in other words, it recognizes financial events as they occur. Hence, it keeps track of all assets and liabilities. It provides the tools to evaluate both the current and future financial picture of an organization. The U.S. Government requires numerous State and local governments and all publicly held companies to prepare financial statements in accordance with GAAP. This ensures that these organizations will use the most sophisticated accounting methods presently available.

A study conducted by Arthur Andersen & Co. compared consolidated financial statements under cash-basis accounting with statements under GAAP. Under GAAP, the more accurate of the two, the deficit for 1984, for instance, was \$148.1 billion higher than under the cash-basis of accounting. Arthur Andersen & Co. has furthermore shown that the National Government has been running deficits which have exceeded the reported deficits by over 100 percent and 200 percent during the last decade.

These deficits manifest a profound problem: A lack of accountability of elected officials to their constituents. Members of Congress, under the present accounting methods, are able to adopt programs which provide benefits currently without providing funding until later

years. Individual citizens are therefore unable to judge whether their representatives are creating and maintaining programs in a fiscally responsible manner.

Thus, I have recently introduced legislation, H.R. 118 the Truth in Government Accounting Act of 1987, which will make the National Government fiscally responsible to the people. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and make public, for each fiscal year, consolidated financial statements for the United States based on accrual accounting procedures. These statements shall include reports on the operations of all instrumentalities of the U.S. Government. This will force the National Government to stop using the cash-basis of accounting and start using the GAAP method.

It also requires that the Secretary of the Treasury publish these statements each year. He will also notify the people about the existence of these statements and make them public by placing a notice on all tax forms that copies of these statements are available and will be sent to all who request them. This will ensure that all citizens have the opportunity to evaluate whether their tax dollars are being spent wisely.

This act also requires the Comptroller General to use the accrual method of accounting to audit the financial statements prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury will provide the Comptroller General with all the necessary information and facilities needed to ensure a successful audit. This will ensure that the financial statements of the National Government are prepared properly and that they meet the highest standards of the accounting profession.

Finally, my bill requires the President, when submitting his budget, to provide a summary of how the use of GAAP procedures would effect estimated expenditures, appropriations, and receipts of the Government in the year for which the budget is submitted. The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall also prepare all budgets submitted to the President according to both the cash and accrual accounting methods. This will enable the public and its elected officials to judge the value of GAAP accounting.

Some have argued that GAAP is not suited for Government use. But Charles A. Bowsher, the Comptroller General of the United States, believes that the financial reporting of the National Government would be much improved by using GAAP. GAAP, in fact, has already been used successfully by governments. The National Government, for instance, required New York City to adopt GAAP during the mid-seventies when that city was experiencing financial woes. Today, partly from improved financial reporting, the fiscal health of New York City is much improved.

The time has come to return our country to the path of fiscal responsibility. Only by forcing the National Government to adopt GAAP will we finally have the accurate data we need to make difficult budget decisions. GAAP will also make Members of Congress more accountable to their constituents. We can further these noble goals by considering and passing my bill.

THE URGENT NEED FOR A NEW COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY POLICY: THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFFSHORE CALIFORNIA

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, this is the second in a series of speeches I am making on the urgent need for a new comprehensive energy policy.

In that context, I would say to my colleagues that such an energy policy must include as one of its major components the timely development of our most promising Federal offshore lands. Clearly, the Federal lands located off the coast of California are some of the most promising unexplored areas in the entire U.S. Outer Continental Shelf.

Unfortunately, for the past few years the Department of the Interior's oil and gas leasing program for the California OCS has been extremely contentious.

In an effort to resolve this controversy, the Congress enacted in the fiscal year 1986 continuing resolution a provision creating a special congressional panel which was charged with the responsibility of negotiating with the Secretary of the Interior.

While the purpose of this panel, of which I am a member, was to foster consensus through good-faith negotiations, regrettably, these negotiations were one-sided in nature.

While Secretary Hodel made an unprecedented effort to achieve a consensus, the no-leasing proponents were more interested in promoting their own selfish political agenda than they were in reaching an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about Federal lands—lands that belong to all Americans. They neither belong to the State of California nor to congressional Representatives who may have coastal districts.

Although we did not reach an agreement, I have learned based on these discussions that there are two truths about the California OCS. First, there is no willingness or desire on the part of the no-leasing proponents to accept any agreement which provides a viable and meaningful leasing program off the coast of California.

And, second, there is absolutely nothing unique about the California coastline which requires extraordinary environmental protection.

Under the provisions of the OCS Lands Act, those desiring to lease offshore California will have to comply with 74 sets of Federal regulations and nearly three dozen major Federal laws concerned with environmental protection and navigation safety.

Since 1970, more than 4 billion barrels of crude oil have been produced offshore with a loss of only 791 barrels at the wellhead. In fact, Federal OCS exploration and development is this Nation's safest energy extraction program.

Mr. Speaker, some might ask why these Federal lands off the coast of California are so important. I would say to my colleagues that they are vital for the following reasons:

First, by developing the California OCS in a timely and safe manner, we can create 250,000 American jobs.

Second, we can significantly reduce the serious environmental threats posed by foreign oil tanker spills. While the Santa Barbara accident of 1968 has received endless publicity in California, what has not been widely reported is that of the 60 largest oil spills that have occurred in American waters, only one was the result of OCS oil and gas activity.

Third, by developing the California OCS we can help satisfy the future energy needs of this Nation. It has been estimated that 6,460 "moratorium" tracts may contain more than 2.2 billion barrels of oil and 4.57 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. The California OCS is the most promising area for oil and gas of any outside the Gulf of Mexico—and it is the only other area with commercial hydrocarbon discoveries.

Fourth, we could reduce our growing foreign oil bill which represented \$52 billion in 1985, or one-third of our total foreign trade deficit.

Fifth, we could increase our energy reserves which have steadily declined—and which are expected to soon reach their lowest level since World War II. With the Prudhoe Bay field, which provides 20 percent of our energy needs, expected to peak and decline by year's end, only the California OCS and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge offer this Nation the opportunity to find and produce new large energy resources for this Nation.

Sixth, and, finally, by developing the California OCS, we could comply with the OCSLA which requires that there be an "equitable sharing of developmental benefits and environmental risks among the various OCS regions."

Mr. Speaker, the time for further negotiations, agreements, or amalgamated proposals is past. I urge my colleagues and Secretary Hodel to treat the OCS program offshore California in exactly the same manner as prescribed by the OCS Lands Act for all offshore areas.

If those offshore lands off the coast of California are as important to the future energy needs of this Nation as I believe they are, then the time has come to take this battle to the floor of the House of Representatives.

With a concerted effort, we can meet America's future energy needs. The stakes in the California OCS battle are high. If we fail, we will guarantee that we will not have a comprehensive energy policy, we will not have a viable OCS leasing program, and we will not avoid repeating the economic nightmare and dislocations of another OPEC oil shock.

Mr. Speaker, we have the power to control our own destiny and protect our national security—and the California environment—by developing these offshore lands in a timely and safe manner.

HARVARD RESPONDS TO STUDENT DEBT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Harvard University Law School recently announced a program to help law school graduates pay off their student loans if they take low-paying public-service jobs. For graduates of the law school who accept law-related positions paying less than \$20,000, the school will undertake all of their student loan payments. For those accepting such jobs paying less than \$29,000, the school will make their loan repayment in excess of 6 percent of the student's income. This is a very commendable and progressive step by Harvard Law School. It responds to a very serious concern associated with the dramatic increases in student loan indebtedness in recent years: that young people will be discouraged from undertaking public service employment because the low salaries associated with such jobs are insufficient to repay their student loans.

Unfortunately this program at Harvard Law School, and similar efforts at other schools such as New York University, Stanford, and Yale, are limited to relatively small groups of students at a few institutions. The fundamental problem of growing student indebtedness remains. Student loans were 17 percent of the Federal aid received by students in the 1975-76 school year. In the 1985-86 school year, loans were 50 percent of the aid received by students. This explosion in student debt has occurred during the Reagan administration whose definition of educational opportunity is long-term indenture. Student indebtedness has risen by approximately \$50 billion during the Reagan years. The answer is to renew the Federal commitment to grant assistance for needy students—an effort which I am confident will begin in earnest during the consideration of the fiscal year 1988 budget and appropriations measures.

On February 21, 1987, an article appeared in the Washington Post describing the Harvard Law School program.

This article follows:

HARVARD TO AID LAW GRADUATES EARNING LESS THAN \$29,000: PLAN WILL FORGIVE OR REDUCE STUDENT LOANS

(By Ruth Marcus)

Harvard Law School, in an effort to relieve the pressure felt by debt-laden students to seek high-paying jobs with law firms, has announced a program to help pay off student loans for graduates who take low-paying public-service jobs.

Dean James Vorenberg announced that the law school will pick up the entire tab for law school student loans for graduates who accept law-related positions paying annual salaries under \$20,000. Graduates taking jobs for less than \$29,000 will pay up to 6 percent of their income, and the law school will pay the balance of the loan.

After financing four years of college and three years of law school, the average Harvard graduate owes \$27,200 in law school loans and a total of \$32,800 in student loans. Renda Jackson, director of the law school's financial aid office, estimated that pay-

ments for \$32,800 in debt would be between \$600 and \$650 monthly.

With starting salaries at major New York law firms now \$65,000 and up, and investment banks wooing law students for positions that pay even more, "most of our students can handle" the loan payments, said Harvard Law Prof. Bernard Wolfman, chairman of the law school's committee on financial aid.

However, he said, the program—which applies for each year the graduate stays in a relatively low-paying job and which allows for annual pay raises of up to \$1,500—is aimed at helping those who would rather work for public-interest groups, legal aid organizations or other law-related positions.

"What we want to do is not have a disincentive, to enable people to make their choices of legal practice free of the impact that the educational loan burden would otherwise have," he said. "Harvard Law School tuition is \$10,700 this year, and nearly two-thirds of the students take out loans, Jackson said.

Under a program established in 1978, Harvard deferred loan repayments for two years for those taking jobs that paid less than \$25,799. In the third year, the school forgave loan payments in excess of 8 percent of the graduate's salary.

The expanded program, Wolfman said, was prompted by rising costs. "The cost of living has grown enormously since this program first got started," he said. He said the new program is expected to cost the law school "a few hundred thousand dollars" a year.

Yale, Stanford and New York University also have programs designed to help young lawyers in relatively low-income jobs pay off their student loans, but Harvard's Low Income Protection Plan is the most extensive, Jackson said. She said 53 graduates participate in the plan.

Public-interest lawyers applauded the announcement, saying that the combination of low salaries and crushing debt had deferred many graduates from taking public-interest jobs.

"There's no question that the loan problem is a major problem even for people who are willing to accept very low salaries," said Alan B. Morrison, director of the Public Citizen Litigation Group.

The litigation group, which does not hire lawyers directly out of law school, pays those with a few years of experience about \$17,000, and its affiliated health and lobbying arms pay starting salaries of \$13,000 to new graduates, he said.

"You can live on these salaries if you want to," Morrison said. "When you talk about paying loans on top of it, it really becomes difficult."

THE DECLINE OF THE DOLLAR

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 25, 1987 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE DECLINE OF THE DOLLAR

After several years at record high levels, the value of the U.S. dollar has recently declined sharply against other major currencies. Although the topic of international ex-

change rates is complex, it is an important one for Americans to understand because of the impact the value of the dollar can have on our standard of living.

Why has the value of the dollar recently changed?

The value of the dollar—the amount of foreign currency it can purchase—is influenced by several economic and political factors: interest rates, inflation, domestic and foreign economic growth patterns, and even the perceived strength of the American political system. In the 1970's, when inflation rose and confidence in our government declined, the value of the dollar fell. In the 1980's, when inflation was low and our economy expanded, other nations began to have renewed confidence in the United States, and the dollar strengthened in comparison to other currencies. By the mid-1980's, in fact, the dollar was considered by many to have risen too much in international markets.

In September 1985, therefore, the United States reached an informal agreement with four major trading partners—Japan, West Germany, France, and Great Britain—to seek a gradual decline in the value of the dollar. With the hint of possible monetary intervention, the dollar began to decline. More recently, with concerns about the increasing U.S. budget and trade deficits and with indications of Administration desires for a further drop in the dollar, a sharper decline in its value occurred. In December, for instance, the dollar purchased 1.97 German marks and 163 Japanese yen; by the end of January, the dollar purchased only 1.77 marks and 150 yen. This drop renewed attention at home and abroad over the appropriate value for the dollar.

What has been the impact of the strong dollar on the American economy?

The strength of the dollar has been a mixed blessing for the continued long-term health of our economy. On the one hand, it made travel abroad cheaper and more attractive to Americans in the early 1980s. The strong dollar also helped to keep the level of inflation low, as imported goods, such as cars, television sets, and stereos, became relatively cheap. On the other hand, cheaper foreign products hurt sales for U.S. producers both at home and abroad. The result was a widening trade deficit between the United States and its leading trading partners, rapidly declining from a surplus of \$6 billion in 1981 to a deficit of \$170 billion last year.

What are some potential benefits of the recent decline in the value of the dollar?

The decline in the dollar could have important benefits for our economy. Over the long haul, it could assist in reducing our trade deficit by making American goods more competitive abroad and more attractive at home. This growth in U.S. sales could increase American jobs as our domestic industries expand and hire more workers. In addition, the boost to the competitiveness of U.S. industry could reduce the pressure to enact protectionist trade legislation that might well be counterproductive in the long term.

Yet we must be careful that the dollar does not drop too rapidly or too far. First, a rapid decline might stimulate inflation. Foreign goods would become more expensive with a falling dollar, and American goods could also rise in price because the competition from foreign goods would be lessened. Second, some economists think that too great a weakening of the value of the dollar may reduce its attractiveness to foreign in-

vestors. To continue to attract these foreign investors to finance our budget deficits, U.S. interest rates would tend to rise. As those higher interest rates work their way through the economy, they might choke off our economic expansion and increase unemployment. Third, a rapid decline could hurt our key allies. Allies, such as Japan and West Germany, are dependent upon substantial exports, and their political and economic welfare could be affected by too rapid a decline in their exports.

What should the U.S. do about the value of the dollar?

My sense is that the dollar should, within limits, continue to decline in order to make our economy still more competitive abroad. The key to this action is that the decline be done in an orderly fashion. Several steps might help.

First, we should continue the quiet, but determined, discussions with our principal trading partners—in particular, Japan and West Germany—to encourage them to expand their economies so as to absorb more of their own production as well as more American goods. Multilateral efforts are more likely to achieve lasting results than actions by the U.S. alone. Second, the United States should continue to urge countries like South Korea and Taiwan, which have linked the value of their currencies to the dollar, to allow their currencies to reflect market conditions. If the dollar declined against these currencies, our significant trade deficit with these countries would likely improve. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the United States itself must take concerted action to reduce its budget deficits. The primary long-term threat from our huge budget deficits is an eventual return of inflation and high interest rates. Reducing the deficits improves our prospects for a healthy economy, and restores investor confidence at home and abroad. That should help stabilize the value of the dollar. In many ways, then, reducing our budget deficits might be the best immediate antidote to any instability in the dollar.

Overall, while we need to pursue a cautious but vigorous policy in seeking some gradual decline in the value of the dollar, we also need to realize that no single action or short-term solution is likely to be sufficient. Only a variety of domestic and international measures sustained over the long term can produce a value of the dollar that is acceptable for the overall health of the U.S. and global economies.

TESTIMONY OPPOSING NRC PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission [NRC] recently proposed a rule change concerning offsite emergency planning. This proposal would allow full power nuclear plant operation to begin when there is a lack of State or local government cooperation in offsite emergency planning. I oppose this proposed ruling and presented my views before the NRC today to that effect. The following is my testimony:

STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. MRAZEK—NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for convening this meeting today in regard to a very important rule change.

As I understand it, the draft proposed rule change would allow full power nuclear plant operation to begin when there is a lack of state or local government cooperation in offsite emergency planning. I am strongly opposed to this change.

As you are aware, many of our laws and regulations are direct responses to unanticipated or unusual events, which after review and investigation reveal the need for a policy change. The most profound example in American nuclear history is Three Mile Island. As I recall, the Commission implemented new regulations in 1980 concerning emergency planning and preparedness in the wake of the accident at Three Mile Island plant, where it was found that the offsite response was grossly inadequate. The aftermath of the Three Mile Island accident portrayed a vivid scenario of exactly what we did not want to see happen in terms of emergency planning in the event of an accident. As a result, a critical policy change came into effect. If implemented, the proposal under study today would reverse the progress made in emergency preparedness over the last eight years since the Three Mile Island accident.

As a representative in Congress, my ultimate concern is working to ensure the health and safety of the residents on Long Island and throughout the country. Given the unique geography of Long Island and the additional emergency planning that must be taken into account because it is an island, I would argue that we must consider issuing more rigid emergency planning measures. Because of the unique geography of Long Island, no one can protect the safety of residents in the most optimal conditions, even employing an emergency plan in which everyone cooperates.

The issue of noncooperation of state and local officials in emergency planning has its roots in the responsibility of assuring public safety. If you recall, state and local authorities have refused to participate in an emergency test. They withdrew because of a fundamental recognition of the fact that residents cannot be safely evacuated. It has been previously addressed at Congressional hearings that the federal government's role is to complement and support the will of the state and local officials, and not to supercede decisions made in the name of public safety. And, perhaps, the veto-power that is mentioned in the staff memorandum to the Commissioners is truly the ultimate check on the entire licensing process.

As I understand it, under this proposed rule change the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) would relinquish its responsibility to make a determination of public safety for the Commission. And, with this "additional flexibility," the Commission could issue a license for full power if an "applicant demonstrates that adequate offsite emergency planning is achievable and all other aspects of foregoing criteria are satisfied." To me, this translates thusly: The Commission can receive a plan from a utility, deem it adequate and feasible, and thereby circumvent the established emergency planning process.

In Congressional hearings last year, it was determined that state and local resources are imperative in any emergency plan of this nature. In addition, in evacuation drills held without state and local officials, seri-

ous deficiencies were uncovered. It is preposterous that a utility, whose ultimate interest is to license its plant, can design and satisfactorily implement an evacuation plan without the participation of state and local officials.

Just one year ago, the world witnessed a nuclear disaster at Chernobyl. The victims were left helpless while the world re-evaluated its policy with regard to safety and emergency planning. As Americans, we could hardly believe the inadequate planning and the irresponsible way in which details in the aftermath of this accident were handled. Unlike the Soviet Union, we have prided ourselves on instituting a system that is responsible to the needs and desires of its population, where safety and public health are the overriding concern in policymaking.

Unfortunately, what we are witnessing today is a proposal that guts our entire licensing system, and usurps the authority of state and local officials to protect the public at large.

I can only conclude that the Commission's ultimate goal is to license nuclear power plants regardless of whether public health and safety can be guaranteed. It is a uniquely irresponsible act on the part of the Commission.

BUSING: LIMITING SUPREME COURT JURISDICTION

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation, H.R. 105, to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and district courts regarding the question of forced busing.

The U.S. Supreme Court handed down a significant decision in *Brown versus Board of Education* in 1954 which declared public school racial segregation unconstitutional. It was almost another decade before the Supreme Court began insisting on integration, not simply desegregation. This decision was an outstanding example of judicial activism, the court going beyond legislation to impose its view of what good social policy should be.

My legislation, if passed, will make an exception to the existing law as provided in the Constitution. In brief, article III, section 2, clause 2 declares that the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction in law and fact but with such exceptions and regulations which Congress might make. The actual citing states:

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the Supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all other Cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

Using this exception, my bill will amend chapter 81 of title 28 of the U.S. Code. A legislative remedy is necessary because the Federal courts have departed from their traditional role as impersonal interpreters of the law and have become active participants in both legis-

lation and administration. In doing so, they have become policy makers and enforcers rather than an independent part of the Government mediating between other branches.

I believe that our Founding Fathers inserted this exception clause in the Constitution to ensure that the will of the majority shall prevail under our system of government. The issue in this particular case is one of freedom. The right to be free from arbitrary, court-mandated busing of one's children regardless of one's color. Court-ordered busing for racial purposes denies citizens the opportunity to attend schools in their local school districts.

Furthermore, the actions of the courts show a strong commitment to forced busing despite overwhelming public opposition, and the policy's record of failure to promote better integrated schools, racial harmony, or better education. Racial discrimination should be combated, but court-ordered busing should be curbed. Busing has brought a flight of students from urban schools, and problems for public school systems already under criticism for not meeting the education needs of American students.

"White flight" continues to be an issue in the public school system as whites continue to abandon this system and enroll in private schools. The reason why this trend continues should not be attributed to racism, but rather to the fact that the quality of our educational system has declined. To help rectify the declining quality of education, busing expenditures resulting from transportation costs should be redistributed in the form of teacher salaries and basic programs to improve the education that our children receive.

In summary, busing creates a negative precedent. It reorders the constitutional powers of two of the three branches of government. It is Congress' inaction that allows this situation to exist. I urge my colleagues to join me in my attempt to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court by cosponsoring H.R. 105.

**DISCRIMINATION IN
EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED**

HON. JOE MOAKLEY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced legislation that will bring equal protection in employment to the handicapped under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Under existing law, there is no generally applicable prohibition against employment discrimination on the basis of handicap. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, but it provides no protection for disabled workers. The widespread exclusion of handicapped workers from employment exacts an enormous toll in terms of human dignity and the quality of life for countless Americans. Over 16 million people age 18 to 64 years reported some level of work disability in the 1976 census. Of this handicapped population, there were only 7.1 million persons working. It is

vital to realize that most of these people desire employment but do not work because of unjust and discriminatory hiring policies.

The handicapped face the dilemma of being discriminated against in employment opportunities because they are evaluated on the basis of false generalizations, misconceptions, and misinformation about their handicaps; not on the basis of their job skills, productivity, or performance. Qualified individuals, time and again, are denied employment because of their disability when the disability would in no way interfere with their job performance. Our handicapped deserve the opportunity to be evaluated and hired on the basis of their ability and not their handicap.

The need for this legislation is obvious. There are too many employers who still will not hire an otherwise qualified individual for the sole reason of his or her disability. Some employers cling to the myths related to hiring the handicapped. Fears of increased insurance rates, lower job performance, job stability, poor attendance, and the required physical adjustment turn employers away from hiring the handicapped. This unnecessary situation weighs a heavy cost on society. In 1980, it was estimated that the Federal Government spent, approximately \$1 out of every \$13 in the Federal budget—\$40 billion—to support our disabled population. State, local, and private support for disabled citizens amounts to approximately an additional \$60 billion. Surely by eliminating employment discrimination of the handicapped we can help reduce this economic burden on taxpayers. Additionally, and more importantly, by enacting this legislation we can help reduce the loss in human terms that is caused by discrimination against handicapped individuals. Too many deserving people are excluded from society's mainstream and left to lose their dignity and self-worth.

The time has come to include handicapped individuals as a protected element in our population under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, protecting handicapped persons against all forms of employment discrimination under that title. We must demonstrate our Nation's firm commitment to ending discrimination against the handicapped by enacting this legislation. I hope my colleagues will support me in my effort to give the handicapped an equal opportunity in employment.

Successful hearings on this legislation were held before the Subcommittee on Employment Opportunities during the 99th Congress. I am hopeful H.R. 192 will continue to move forward in the upcoming months.

Text of the bill follows:

H.R. 192
A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to make discrimination against handicapped individuals an unlawful employment practice.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a reference in section 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 of this Act to a section or other provision is a reference to a section or other provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

SEC. 2. Section 701 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(1)(1) The term 'handicap' means the status of any individual—

"(A) who has a physical or mental impairment which substantially limits any of such individual's major life activities;

"(B) who has a record of such impairment; or

"(C) who is regarded as having such an impairment.

"(2) Such term does not include the status of an individual who is an alcoholic or a drug abuser—

"(A) whose current use of alcohol or drugs prevents such individual from performing the job involved; or

"(B) whose employment, because of such current use of alcohol or drugs, would constitute a direct threat to property or safety of other individuals."

SEC. 3. (a) Sections 703(a)(1), 703(a)(2), 703(b), 703(c)(1), 703(c)(2), 703(d), and 703(e)(1) are each amended by striking out "or national origin" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

(b) The sentence beginning "Notwithstanding any" in section 703(h) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or national origin" the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap"; and

(2) by striking out "sex or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "sex, national origin, or handicap".

(c) Section 703(j) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or national origin" the first place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap";

(2) by inserting after "national origin" the second place it appears the following: ", or persons with any handicap"; and

(3) by inserting after "national origin" the third place it appears the following: ", or persons with such handicap".

(d) The center heading of section 703 is amended by striking out "NATIONAL ORIGIN" and inserting in lieu thereof "NATIONAL ORIGIN, OR HANDICAP".

SEC. 4. Section 704(b) is amended by striking out "or national origin" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 5. The sentence beginning "No order of the court" in section 706(g) is amended by striking out "or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 6. (a) Section 717(a) is amended by striking out "or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "national origin, or handicap".

(b) Section 717(c) is amended by striking out "sex or national origin" and inserting in lieu thereof "sex, national origin, or handicap".

SEC. 7. The amendments made by this Act do not affect any right, remedy, obligation, or responsibility under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SEC. 8. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect at the beginning of the sixth month after the month in which this Act is enacted.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my distinguished minority leader and a number of our colleagues in introducing the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act. This legislation was developed by the Department of Health and Human Services in cooperation with the White House.

Though significant progress has been made with regard to the development of constructive, compassionate health care policies, there are still enormous gaps in health insurance coverage for millions of Americans. The absence of universal protection against the potentially devastating costs of catastrophic illnesses is one of the most troubling of these gaps.

Last year, in an effort to begin to address this problem, the President, in his 1986 State of the Union Message, ordered a comprehensive study on how the private sector and the Government could work together to address the problem of affordable insurance for those whose life savings would otherwise be threatened when catastrophic illness strikes.

In November 1986, Health and Human Services Secretary Otis Bowen issued a report containing numerous recommendations in response to the President's charge. Secretary Bowen's report was the culmination of months of public hearings and sessions involving the input of a broad spectrum of the public including consumers, providers, and insurers as well as elected officials.

I believe it is important that we acknowledge the significant accomplishment of the President and the tireless efforts of Secretary Bowen in moving this long-discussed and very important issue to the front burner. The Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act will certainly set the stage for much needed action in this area.

It should be emphasized that this legislation is not being offered as a solution to the problems facing all Americans who do not have catastrophic health insurance protection. It is, however, a first step. I am pleased to be one of its sponsors.

I should also point out that I will soon be joining the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Health in the introduction of additional medicare catastrophic legislation. That proposal and the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act, though they may be somewhat different in approach, unquestionably point us in the direction we ought to be heading.

IMPERIAL COUNTY LIBRARY CELEBRATES 75TH YEAR

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1912, the Imperial County Board of Supervi-

sors voted to establish the Imperial County Library. The library's first responsibility would be to provide free library service to all residents through branches and stations.

In the early years, the branches consisted of everything from a boxcar to a ranch and even a service station housed a collection of books. To the residents of Imperial County, the main concern was not where the material was stored but that they had finally established a library.

By 1918, the library had grown to serve 58 branches and 54 schools in the county. In 1928, a Ford sedan was given to the library, and it marked the beginning of regular deliveries and "field trips" to remote areas of the county. This service is one of the basic components that has remained with the library.

Because of private citizens and businesses, the dream of the 1912 board of supervisors has become a reality. The library system serves an area that covers 4,275 square miles and 38,000 citizens. Thanks to a grant from the California State Library, a literacy program has been set up to serve Spanish-speaking residents as well.

The Imperial County Library is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. It is evident that over those 75 years a lot of hard work and determination went into building the library into the great resource for learning that it is today.

I hope that the fine people of Imperial County take a few moments out of their celebration and pat themselves on the back for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to include in my remarks the proclamation issued by the Imperial County Board of Supervisors.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Through foresight and understanding the Board of Supervisors on February 6, 1912 established the Imperial County Free Library under Section 2 of the County Library Law. The Board consisted of J.J. Carr, Chairman, E.E. Bennet, R.H. Clark, R.E. Willis and E.E. Boyd

Whereas, The library has continued to serve the residents of Imperial County with branches in local communities with adult and juvenile books, reference materials, audio-visual aids, periodicals, inter-library loan service and literacy training

Whereas, The library has vigorously worked to improve, broaden and update library materials as needed and within the bounds of funding provided by the Board of Supervisors

Whereas, This service has been a continuous, beneficial and educational benefit to the residents of Imperial County

Therefore we recognize 75 years of library service to this community and congratulate the Imperial County Library on its 75th birthday, February 6, 1987 and designate the week of February 1 through February 8, 1987 as Imperial County Library Week.

LET'S SAVE THE FHA

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, with my colleague from Ohio, Mr.

WYLIE, legislation which would greatly improve the ability of low- and moderate-income families to buy and own their own homes. It is my firm belief that this legislation is of utmost importance and deserves our immediate attention.

The bill we've introduced would permanently extend the insuring authority of the Federal Housing Administration.

The FHA, since its inception in 1934, has helped over 15 million Americans buy their own homes and a share in the American dream. We have a chance, and I believe a responsibility, to preserve the dream of homeownership and to ensure the peace of mind of millions of families.

For Oregon, every time a house is bought it's good news. Oregon is an interest-rate sensitive State. We depend on a healthy and thriving housing industry. The number of housing starts has long been an accurate barometer of our economic health. And the FHA mortgage program has been one of the single biggest contributors to a healthy housing industry, offering low interest and low downpayment requirements that unlock the door for millions of first-time home buyers.

Although the program has been a tremendous success, costs no money to the taxpayer, and is a perfect combination of public/private partnership, for the last several years it has come under unjustified attack.

First, the administration tried to kill the program outright. Congress said "no." Failing that, it proposed changes in the program which would prevent a lot of families from being able to get FHA mortgages, double the expected necessary downpayment, and greatly increase closing costs. Congress again said "no." Next, the administration investigated the feasibility of selling the FHA to the private sector and the investigative report, just released, says "no."

At the same time, FHA has been caught in a recurring political tug-of-war. Last year alone Congress shut the program on and off six times, before finally extending it last September.

It's well past time to stop turning FHA on and off as though it didn't have an impact. It does. While FHA has been held up, many Americans have been inconvenienced, their dreams of home ownership smashed.

If we don't act before September 30, 1987, the program expires. My friends, we can't afford to let this happen. And the last thing we need is another short-term extension. Let's make the program permanent. We know it works. We know why it's important.

I welcome and invite your support for a permanent extension of the FHA's insuring authority, and commend my colleague, Mr. WYLIE, for his leadership on this issue.

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO LE ROY BORCHARDT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to pay tribute today to Le Roy Bor-

chardt, a man who has devoted a lifetime of service to his country and community.

Le Roy honorably served for 33 years in the U.S. Navy. He has spent the last 6 years at the Lakewood High School as the assistant naval instructor, a position he continues to hold. Also, Le Roy heads the only silent drill team in California which has won several statewide and national championship competitions. He has indeed brought great honor to his campus.

Le Roy has been an active supporter of the Boy Scouts of America. He has provided surplus training manuals to the Sea Explorers and is now arranging for surplus uniforms to be delivered to the girl members. This past Thanksgiving, Le Roy spent the holiday apart from his family so as to be a judge in the 1986 Sea Explorers Rendezvous.

Mr. Speaker, Le Roy Borchardt has been a positive force in our community. He has been a strong supporter of the drug suppression task force of Lakewood High School. He has, and continues to, set an example for his fellow teachers, students, and citizens.

My wife, Lee, and I join in commending and congratulating Le Roy Borchardt on this special occasion. We wish him, his wife Susie, and his two sons Barry and Gary continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 97, regarding the rights and freedom of American workers. The purpose of this legislation is to preserve the free choice of individuals to join or not to join labor organizations. The original intent of the Federal labor law was to guarantee employees the right to form or join labor organizations free from interference. This of course, implies that the right not to join should also be completely free of coercion.

In various parts of our Nation, employees are compelled to pay dues to a union or lose their jobs. Because of this contradiction between original legislative intent and the actual everyday practice, it is necessary to revive this debate. Forced union membership violates basic rights and it is necessary to restore the freedom of choice to all American workers. If the government does not provide its citizens with their constitutional guarantee of freedom of choice, our country will find it very difficult to convince its citizens, particularly its younger citizens, that our statements about individual freedoms are anything more than a rhetorical sham.

Many of the same legislators who see freedom of choice as a virtue in all matters, contradict this theory when labor unions are involved. They speak of individual freedom when opposing military service, the operations of our intelligence agencies, or opposing racial, sexual, or ethnic discrimination, but become strangely silent over the simple proposition that each American should have the right to decide whether or not to join a labor

union. This is difficult to understand. If labor unions are in the best interest of workers, they would want to join them voluntarily. If they are not in the best interest of workers, why should government compel them to join?

Unfortunately, organized labor has contributed millions of dollars to political campaigns in order to purchase support for this kind of coercion. American labor previously believed in freedom of choice. Samuel Gompers, who founded the American Federation of Labor declared that, "There may be here and there a worker who for certain reasons * * * does not join a union of labor. That is his right." Today's labor leaders do not share this view, and for this reason I would like to urge my colleagues to support a policy of freedom of choice when it comes to joining or not joining a labor union.

COMPETITIVE CURRENCY DEBASEMENT

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the Discussion Club of St. Louis, MO, under the chairmanship of H.F. Langenberg, is a highly regarded forum where, over the years, many burning national and international issues have been debated.

The guest speaker at the February 18, 1987 meeting of the club was Prof. A.E. Fekete of the Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada. His thesis is that the present experimentation with currency debasement is a mindless repetition of the disastrous policy of competitive currency devaluations of the 1930's. History books refer to that episode as the "beggar-thy-neighbor" policy, which led the nations to trade war and a seize up of world trade, thus greatly prolonging the Great Depression.

It is tragic that the governments of the day do not realize they are treading the same dangerous and slippery path, running the risk of a new trade war. There is no virtue in driving down the value of the national currency. Such a policy invites retaliation in kind, giving impetus to a downward spiral at the bottom of which lies the mass grave of currencies.

The virtue is in upholding the value of the national currency against all odds, and this is the message from St. Louis.

Professor Fekete's address follows:

COMPETITIVE CURRENCY DEBASEMENT

(By Antal E. Fekete)

A FORGOTTEN ANNIVERSARY

Last year the 50th anniversary of a momentous event in the monetary history of the world came and passed unnoticed: the devaluation of the Swiss franc in September, 1936. The event marked the completion of the cycle of competitive currency devaluations, which was triggered by the devaluation of the British pound in 1931 and of the U.S. dollar in 1933. In retrospect it became clear that the course of competitive devaluations (alias 'beggar thy neighbor' policy) was a dangerous experiment leading to trade war. It did not end the Depression, but made it deeper and longer. The effort to

gain trade advantages, not by offering better products at lower prices, but by cheapening the currency, is self-defeating. Soft currency is no substitute for hard work. Currency manipulation invites retaliation in kind, and gives rise to a vicious spiral at the end of which lies the destruction of all currencies, implying social and economic chaos.

50 years ago these truths were recognized, and the concerned governments decided to stabilize their currencies in terms of gold, thereby halting the crazy game to see who can give away the most goods for the least amount of money—they put an end to the fools' auction before it was too late.

It would be reasonable to assume that 50 years is not too great a span of time so that the lessons of history may be remembered. Unfortunately, this is not the case. We now find ourselves parroting the arrant nonsense that the worst currency is the best, and the best the worst. Once more, we have chosen the primrose path leading to the destruction of currencies. And we find the path more slippery than it was 50 years ago. In the 1930's the devaluing governments had to suffer the ignominy of breaking faith with their citizens and creditors. Today no stigma is attached to currency debasement. On the contrary, deliberate defrauding of citizens and creditors is hailed as shrewd statesmanship, and currency debasement is an accepted instrument of statecraft, the approved equilibrating mechanism to be used to correct "fundamental disequilibria".

We have come a long way since the 1930's, when governments had to suffer the opprobrium evoked by their act of bad faith. Today devaluations are out, and continuous debasement is in. The whole process appears to be entirely innocent and natural. We are even lectured by the experts that it was the stable dollar (sic!) which meant the perversion of the free market. After all, if the price of wheat fluctuates naturally along with supply and demand, then why not the dollar? Yet, in spite of the rhetoric, our international monetary system has fallen victim to the same old bankrupt and discredited policy of competitive devaluations, and will lead to another trade war.

THE GUILTY STANDARD

Currency debasers are loud in their contention that adoption of their panaceas would have a stimulating effect on exports and thus assist the revival of industry. They are blandly oblivious to the fact that exports must be purchased by imports and that, while currency depreciation might permit a nation to sell more cheaply abroad, it compelled the depreciation nation to pay more dearly for its imports. The nation must pay more, not less, in terms of exports, for the same amount of imports. The terms of trade worsen.

It should be clear that we have traveled far along a very dangerous road. The powers now vested in our government, especially in unelected officials such as Secretary of the Treasury Baker and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board Volcker, are inherently obnoxious, not only to free enterprise, but also to constitutional government. Cunning with money has become a national obsession. Politicians try to be clever with money, rather than wise.

The fact is that currency debasement is the method used by reckless spendthrift governments to rob the thrifty citizens of the purchasing power of their hard-earned money. It is political dishonesty, even if it is dressed in scientific garb. It is the initial

notice of approaching national bankruptcy. This creeping fraud, if permitted to run its course, will obliterate individual liberty.

Down through the ages stable money has shown that character and wisdom are more important than cunning and guile for success, and the gold standard is the embodiment of this principle. Now the gold standard is replaced by the guile standard; and we have to suffer the consequences. If the people allow the value of their money to be manipulated by the politicians, then they give away their birthright to be used or abused at the pleasure of their master's slippery conscience.

Another striking indictment of the world's present monetary arrangements in respect to floating foreign changes is that it introduces the element of coercion, the paraphernalia of bribe and blackmail into international division of labor. Countries with a larger foreign trade can now use extortion in furthering their economic goals in the international arena. Secretary of the Treasury Baker has often stated publicly that if Germany and Japan do not use monetary and fiscal stimuli in their domestic economy, then the U.S. will punish them by beating down the international value of the dollar.

It is a melancholy fact—and alas one full of portent—that no living man less than 80 years of age now knows at first hand what it was like to live in a naturally functioning world market free of coercion. Basically the pre-1914 world automatically maintained its own economic balance. There were no economic planners, no professional currency manipulators and debasers. Reference to statistical series clearly shows that the condition of business in which our grandfathers worked were more stable than those which enmesh our generation.

HUMPTY DOLLAR SAT ON A WALL

The decision of September 22, 1985, announced at the Plaza Hotel in New York by Secretary of the Treasury Baker and the Group of Five, to force the devaluation of the dollar in terms of foreign exchange, was hailed by the London Economist on its frontpiece, depicting the dollar in the shape of Humpty Dumpty sitting on the high wall, pleading thus:

"Please sell dollars to bring me down!" And then, again:

"Please buy dollars to finance my deficits! Finally:

"I intend to fall without getting egg on anybody's face!" Now, Humpty Dollar has had a great fall, and all the President's soldiers and all the President's men could not put Humpty Dollar together again.

The Plaza decision was incredible, for several reasons. Here is a great government, throwing overboard its constitutional responsibility and obligation to maintain the integrity of the currency of the people, engaging in an unsavory effort to beat down the value of the dollar, thereby eroding the value of the savings of its citizens, as well as the value of the investments of its creditors. At the same time the representatives of four other governments rub their hands and smile at the prospect of the staggering losses their citizens and their central banks who have invested heavily in the U.S. dollar are facing, as a consequence of their complicity in the plot against the dollar.

But the rhetoric pouring forth from Washington about the strong dollar and the weak yen, and the timeliness of swapping roles, could not conceal the fact that the world was succumbing to the whirlpool of competitive currency debasement. There

was nothing strong about the dollar in 1985. The other currencies had been quietly debased earlier. It was the dollar's turn to take a bath. The hecatomb of currencies was upon us once more. The debasement dance of St. Vitus was about to start again. Fifty years ago the manipulation of currencies began with the self-immolation of the British pound. It was followed by the self-mutilation of the U.S. dollar. Virtually every currency of the world was devalued in a game of "follow-the-leader". The show was not over until that most virtuous and sober of all countries, Switzerland, also decapitated its currency. This chapter was one of the most ignominious in the annals of currency mismanagement. Governments could hardly hide their shame over such a blatant breach of faith. For weeks, ministers of finance vehemently asserted that devaluation was "unthinkable". Then, on a quiet Sunday, with the markets conveniently closed, they ate their words and devalued. The great tragedy of it all was that competitive devaluations, the breach of promises, the bad faith, and the official lies failed to achieve their stated goal, namely, economic revival. The Great Depression ran its course helped rather than hampered by devaluations.

HOW TO FOOL ALL THE PEOPLE ALL THE TIME

In the 1930's the U.S. government—abandoning honor and constitutional responsibility—embarked upon a course of beating down the foreign exchange value of the dollar. Then, as now, it was suggested by government economists that the measure was necessary in order to bolster exports, discourage imports, to alleviate the burden of debt, to realign lopsided exchange rates, to prevent trade war—and a host of other laudable objectives. Yet none of those objectives was realized; instead, the crisis was prolonged by the policy of competitive currency devaluations. There was no rational hope for devaluations to achieve their stated objectives then, as there is no chance to do it now. Neither a nation, nor a group of nations can increase its wealth or its well-being by undermining the value of the currency. It is a gross fallacy to imagine that the trade balance can be helped by currency debasement. There is no export industry that would not be adversely affected by the higher import prices it would have to pay in the future. Moreover, curbing imports spells vanishing world trade, depression, stagnation. Those government economists who say that they can make exports more competitive and imports less competitive by manipulating the value of the currency downwards believe—against all reason, in the face of all historical evidence, and in defiance of Lincoln's dictum—that you can fool all the people all the time.

But if they believe that, then they can believe anything. They believe that the one-armed cobblers can persuade their two-armed colleagues that, in the interest of increasing wealth and trade, they should give up the use of one of their arms. They also believe that the two-armed cobblers willingly undergo the amputation of one of their arms. And they also believe that, after all cobblers had their right hands cut off, the production of footwear in the country is enhanced.

THE FALLACY THAT DEBASING THE DOLLAR WOULD AID THE EXPORT BUSINESS

Many people favor the deliberate debasement of the dollar for its alleged benefits to our balance of trade. The belief that a falling dollar would stimulate exports and inhibit imports is one that dies hard. But if

authoritative opinion and the weight of statistical evidence could kill it, it would have died 50 years ago. Robert Lincoln O'Brien, the chairman of the Tariff Commission in the early 1930's, thoroughly exposed the fallacy time and again, and very aptly told the House Committee on Ways and Means: "The advantages of currency depreciation are partly illusory and partly temporary; those that are not illusory are temporary, and those that are not temporary are illusory."

The French economy, for example, has been "blessed" with a continuously depreciating currency for most of the past 70 years. Yet French exports were hampered, not helped by what the world came to call the "French disease". When the British contracted the French disease, and the British pound was put on the roller-coaster, British exports did not go up, they went into a tail-spin.

The late American monetary scientist, B.M. Anderson, Jr., observed in 1933: "When men are dealing with sound money, when they trust money and their minds are on the value of their products and the prospects of the market for their products, rather than on the vicissitudes of fluctuating or depreciating currencies, then a rise in prices is a stimulant to trade and a stimulant to production. When, however, prices are rising merely because money is falling, and because men distrust money, the reverse is taking place. Speculation overtakes trade and production. The prudent merchant, studying his local market and studying his sources of supply, has no chance. The reckless plunger is successful. The prudent industrialist, studying his costs carefully, analyzing the prospects of sales, has no chance. Careful economies, skillful administration of resources, prudent planning, conservative enterprise, thrift—all these things—are at a discount. Reckless and unscrupulous men, borrowing all they can, sometimes go bankrupt in the fluctuations of the market, but those of them that are successful are the only ones that can save themselves in such a period. The laborer, not trained in finance, slow to grasp the significance of pecuniary debasement, finds himself with rising wages but also with still more rapidly rising cost of living, slipping further and further behind in the race. Universities, hospitals, churches, endowed institutions of all kinds, are unable to make any readjustments that can save them. Production gives way, the total volume of goods available for the people to consume is reduced, wealth is eroded.

"Alert speculators move rapidly, but the masses, including even many businessmen, tend, for a good while, to reach in habitual ways in their calculations. But, if the debts are shaken, and general fear for the future of the currency comes over the people, catastrophe impends.

"The distinction between rising goods and falling money is one which is forced promptly upon the attention of all those engaged in exporting and importing, by the daily fluctuations of the exchange rates. Export trade is badly demoralized by currency depreciation. When men trust their money, as under the gold standard, an adverse balance of payments gives a meaningful stimulus to exports and it meaningfully inhibits imports. The money market tightens as gold leaves the country. Exporters find their credit shortened and sell more quickly. Importers are getting less credit and import less freely, and the automatic forces rectify the adverse balance of payments.

"When, however, exchange is depreciating solely because of the decline in the quality of money, and through distrust in the value of money, the reverse takes place. The reactions of exporters and importers are the exact opposite. Exporters reason that they should not hurry to export because they can get still more domestic currency for their exports at a later time; importers reason that they must hasten to import all that they can because the foreign exchange in which they will pay for their imports will cost more in domestic currency next week, next month, or next year.

"There is nothing wholesome in economic life that results from a rise in prices which is merely a flight from the money, or which is due simply to currency debasement."

INTRODUCTION OF THE AGRICULTURE IN TRANSITION ACT

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I joined with my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, Mr. BEREUTER, in introducing the Agriculture in Transition Act of 1987. This bill is the first measure in a two-part initiative that will amend the Job Training Partnership Act to more adequately provide comprehensive assistance to farmers, and to other individuals within rural communities, who are displaced due to the depressed agricultural economy.

The Agriculture in Transition Act will establish a grant program designed to target employment training assistance to States and areas of the country that have been heavily impacted by problems confronting agriculture today. This form of supplemental assistance, which will be added as a new grant program under the Dislocated Worker Program in title III of the Job Training Partnership Act, is necessary to meet the current needs of individuals in hard-hit farming communities.

Existing law does allow for employment training assistance to be provided to this population. However, unemployed individuals in rural America, and particularly those within the agricultural regions, have traditionally been difficult to identify and to serve under current programs. While existing job training programs are being restructured to better serve individuals in rural communities and particularly those displaced from farming, it is especially important to provide adequate assistance to people in need now during this transitional period.

The bill introduced yesterday establishes a new 5-year grant program within title III of JTPA to supplement ongoing efforts in serving the dislocated farmer population. It allows for statewide, as well as for local service delivery area programs to be set up to provide comprehensive employment and training assistance and it encourages grantees to develop programs offered in coordination with other non-JTPA offerings to be set up at a common site. This type of service delivery could, for example, allow distressed farmers to seek financial counseling, and even farm management assistance—a service not allowed under JTPA—at the same site as he or she would

be provided transitional—employment and training—assistance, if deciding to leave farming as their primary occupation.

Under this program, those intending to discontinue farming, either totally or as a primary occupation, would be eligible to receive job search assistance, assessment, counseling, and employment training services, similar to those as provided for under the existing Dislocated Worker Program. For financially distressed farmers not intending to leave farming but seeking assistance, financial counseling and emergency assistance may be provided to enable them to determine whether or not they should remain on the farm or seek another primary occupation. Individuals enrolled and successfully progressing in training programs may be provided subsistence allowances and other benefits including transportation and child-care assistance. Such allowances would be based however on the grantee's determination that these services are necessary for participation in the program and where program participants are ineligible for unemployment insurance and other forms of comparable assistance.

Finally, the definition of eligible participants under the current title III program would be expanded, for the purposes of this grant program to include three new sets of individuals:

First, those individuals certifying they are leaving farming based on one or more of the following: foreclosure; bankruptcy; failure to return a profit over the previous 12 month period; inability to obtain operating capital; inability to make loan payments; or debts to assets ratio exceeding 70/30 percent; second, those individuals leaving farming as their primary occupation due to high debts-to-assets ratios as defined by USDA; and third, those individuals displaced from agriculture-related businesses due to the depressed agricultural economy.

As mentioned previously, in addition to the bill introduced yesterday, we plan to introduce a second measure in the near future that will make a number of changes in the current delivery structure of the Dislocated Worker Program, so that the new targeted grant program need only be a temporary solution. The second part of this package will provide increased local input in development of area dislocated worker training programs. These changes should improve the program's ability to more adequately serve ongoing rural employment needs, and particularly to better serve dislocated farmers. This measure will be designed to break down a number of the barriers now experienced in providing services in rural America.

Again, the Agriculture in Transition Act, introduced yesterday, will serve the immediate needs of individuals displaced in agriculture today. And, the second part of this initiative will amend the current Dislocated Worker Program delivery system—enabling programs under title III of the Job Training Partnership Act to adequately meet the needs of displaced rural individuals, and particularly those displaced from farming in the future. While no one in this Congress wants to see farmers leave farming or workers displaced from their jobs in rural communities, we must do everything in our power to see that these individuals are provided with assistance to make the

necessary transitions to other occupations as painless and as successful as possible. I feel that these initiatives described here will do just this. It is my hope that two measures will be referred to the Education and Labor Committee at the appropriate time, as both amend the Job Training Partnership Act for which that committee has jurisdiction.

RAISE THE CIGARETTE EXCISE TAX

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to raise the Federal excise tax on cigarettes to 40 cents a package, and to permanently index it to the Consumer Price Index, so that the tax will be adjusted annually according to the rate of inflation.

Never have the reasons for raising this tax been stronger. A rise of 24 cents from the current level of 16 cents would produce \$4.8 billion a year in desperately needed new revenue to reduce the enormous budget deficit and, at the same time, help compensate the Federal Government for the costs associated with smoking-related illnesses.

From 1951 through 1982, the excise tax on cigarettes was 8 cents a package. Last year Congress permanently raised this tax to 16 cents. However, much has happened since 1951 to justify a more substantial increase. For one thing, consumer prices have risen more than 400 percent since 1951, so simply to maintain the tax's original revenue-raising power, it ought to be increased to 32 cents a package. Second, 36 years ago the harmful effect of smoking on human health was not well understood—it is now well known and well documented.

C. Everett Koop, the Surgeon General of the United States, calls cigarette smoking "the most important individual health risk in this country." He blames smoking for more premature deaths and disabilities than any other known agent. Says Dr. Koop, "There is no single more effective action a person can take to reduce the risk of cancer—and of dying from it—than to quit smoking, especially cigarette smoking."

The amount of damage done by cigarettes is truly staggering. The Surgeon General links smoking to 30 percent of all cancer deaths. Smoking is a major cause of cancers of the lungs, larynx, oral cavity, and esophagus, and a major contributor to cancers of the bladder, kidney, and pancreas. Smoking accounts for 80 to 90 percent of all chronic lung disease in the United States, including chronic bronchitis and emphysema, and for one-third of all coronary heart disease, says the Surgeon General. And smoking by pregnant women has been linked to premature birth, fetal injury, and low birth weight.

The harmful effects of passive smoking are also becoming clearer, and studies now show that the children, spouses, and coworkers of smokers suffer greater health risks than those not exposed to smokers on a regular basis.

In sum, cigarette smoking is responsible for more than 300,000 premature deaths in the United States each year, 16 percent of deaths from all causes, an enormous amount of disease and disability, and untold physical and emotional pain. The human consequences are terrible enough, yet smoking results in enormous economic costs as well.

In 1985 the Office of Technology Assessment estimated that smoking-related health care costs and lost productivity costs amount to between \$39 and \$96 billion annually, with a middle estimate of \$65 billion, or \$2.17 for each package of cigarettes sold in the United States. Smokers bear much of this economic burden; however, we all share it to some extent through higher insurance premiums, higher costs for Government health programs, and higher costs for consumer goods.

Absenteeism caused by smoking translates into higher costs for consumer products. Non-smokers and business that contribute to employee health plans pay higher insurance rates to help pay the cost of treating smoking-related illnesses. Smoking also leads to higher Government outlays: nearly \$3.4 billion a year in increased spending for Medicare alone.

Congress began to recognize the growing need for education about the seriousness of smoking hazards when it passed the Comprehensive Smoking Education Act of 1984, the first major smoking and health legislation enacted on the Federal level in over 15 years. That law required that cigarette packages and advertising include four new health warnings to be rotated quarterly. Local governments and the private sector have also begun to recognize the right of nonsmokers to a healthy smoke-free environment through initiatives which discourage or prohibit smoking in certain public areas, signaling a growing mood in America that smokers alone, and to the general population, should bear the costs and consequences associated with their habit.

A survey conducted by the Los Angeles Times in February 1986 found that 81 percent of Americans favor a higher tax on cigarettes as a means of reducing the deficit. The legislation I am introducing today would help compensate for 36 years of inflation, provide for future inflation, and bring the cigarette tax more in line with current knowledge about the costs and dangers of smoking. It would also make a substantial contribution toward reducing the Federal deficit. And, because studies show that price increases result in corresponding consumption decreases, particularly among teenagers, a tax increase would likely prevent thousands of young people from ever starting this very dangerous habit.

The cigarette tax is a significant, relatively untapped, potentially lucrative, and entirely justifiable source of revenue. Together with spending cuts and other revenue-raising measures, this tax will help reduce the Federal deficit and pave the way for a strong and long-lasting period of economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation and enacting it into law.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH, 1987

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1987

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Nation Black History Month.

Thomas Carlyle, the Scottish historian, once wrote that: "The history of the world is but the biography of great men." This is certainly true of black history, for the tale of the contributions made by blacks to our culture is but the tale of courageous, farsighted, and dedicated men and women.

From the time of the earliest colonial settlements, black men and women have played an integral role in the development of American life. Despite the fact that slavery remains an indelible blot upon the history of mankind, the fact that so many blacks were able to overcome the handicap of this horrible inhumanity is a tribute to their perseverance, and is one of history's prime examples of the triumph of the human spirit.

Crispus Attucks, a freed slave, was killed while leading the protest against British injustices that became known as the Boston Massacre in 1770. He is often referred to as the first person to give his life for American independence. The accomplishments of Benjamin Banneker, an 18th-century American astronomer, mathematician, and mapmaker, caused him to be called "the Black Ben Franklin." He served on the commission that laid out the plan for our Nation's Capital here in Washington, DC.

Frederick Douglass, an escaped slave, was one of our Nation's premier diplomats and journalists during the 19th century. Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth performed superhuman efforts to bring about freedom for their brothers and sisters. Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois both dedicated their lives to the education and advancement of black people, and George Washington Carver's scientific discoveries created a better life for us all. Later generations were inspired and taught by black educators, diplomats, and advisers to Presidents, such as Mary McLeod Bethune, Ralph Bunche, and Dr. Robert C. Weaver.

The industrial revolution in America, our greatest period of industrial expansion and invention, was helped along by the contributions of Granville T. Woods, the inventor of air brakes and other equipment that made rail travel safe, Jan Matzeliger, who revolutionized the shoe industry, and Lewis H. Latimer, who was Tom Edison's right hand assistant.

The age of jazz, called the first truly original American art form, was heralded by those black musicians who first invented and then perfected this unique musical style. This art form was pioneered by "Jelly Roll" Morton, Scott Joplin, "Fats" Waller, Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong, and their contemporaries, but the torch was carried forward by Ella Fitzgerald, Lena Horn, and yet later by Ray Charles, Chuck Berry, Ben E. King, and a host of others.

Today, Americans of all ages and musical tastes enjoy the talents of black artists as diverse as Michael Jackson, Johnny Mathis,

Charley Pride, Herbie Hancock, and Al Jarreau.

All Americans can justly be proud of the accomplishment of sports superstars such as Jackie Robinson, Joe Louis, Jesse Owens, Floyd Patterson, and O.J. Simpson. Authors such as Paul Dunbar, Langston Hughes, Richard Wright, James Baldwin, Lorraine Hansberry, Alex Haley, and Alice Walker have used the written word to articulate the hopes, desires, and despair of black people in a universal way to which we can all relate.

Hattie McDaniels, Sidney Poitier, and Louis Gossett, Jr., although the only blacks to win Academy Awards for acting so far, are merely representative of the thousands of black men and women who entertain us in the motion picture, radio, stage, and television arts. In fact, the most popular television series on the air today stars a black actor—Bill Cosby—whom the public opinion polls cite as the most respected American alive today.

The field of civil rights has produced a host of black leaders whose moral and intellectual inspiration has done much to further the cause of equality for all people. Were it not for the leadership and inspiration of A. Philip Randolph, Thurgood Marshall, Rosa Parks, Medgar Evers, Jesse Jackson, and the sainted Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and others like them, we Americans may still not be reminded that a denial of basic rights to any people threatens a denial of the rights of all of us.

Imagine what our Government would be today were it not for the outstanding contributions of the outstanding black legislators and administrators of the past quarter century: leaders like Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, Ed Brooke, Julian Bond, Andrew Young, Patricia Roberts Harris, Sam Pierce, Maynard Jackson, and Kenneth Gibson.

Today, there is no facet of our society that has not enjoyed the contributions of, and leadership from, black Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues understand that my litany of outstanding black Americans cannot be all inclusive, but in fact only recounts the tip of the iceberg. A recital of those blacks who have contributed to make a better world for us all would consume many days on the floor of this Chamber.

These remarks are intended to call our attention to just some outstanding black Americans, and to note that there is no field of human endeavor to which our black citizenry did not apply itself.

Mr. Speaker, Black History Month is an appropriate time to thank black America for their contributions to our Nation, and to make all Americans aware of these contributions.

THE AFRO-AMERICAN AND THE CONSTITUTION: COLONIAL TIMES TO THE PRESENT

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1987

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, each February is designated by the Association of Afro-Americans Life and History as Black History Month. It is a time during which

both black Americans and all other Americans pay special attention to the history of people of color in this country and to the relationships among races and national groups. It is a time when we discuss how we can develop a "more perfect union" among the various groups which make up this country, how we can establish justice among all of our fellow countrymen, how we can insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare for people of all races and ethnic groups. And, most importantly, it is a time during which we ponder how to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

The theme of this year's Black History Month celebration is "The Afro-American and the Constitution: Colonial Times to the Present." This requires us to take an honest look, not only at how the development of our theories of law and liberty eventually advanced and improved the position of black people in this country, but also at how the actual wording of the Constitution impeded our struggle toward freedom. As Judge Leon Higginbotham has written:

This new nation, "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," began its experiment in self-government with a legacy of more than one-half million enslaved blacks—persons denied citizenship and enslaved, not for criminal infractions, but solely as a matter of color.

The Constitution was born in a compromise between freedom and the political might of the slave States. It disenfranchised slaves, condemned and abandoned them to their lowly position, counted them as three-fifths of a man, and guaranteed the continuance of their oppression.

As historian John Hope Franklin wrote:

The fathers of the Constitution were dedicated to the proposition that "government should rest upon the dominion of property." For the Southern fathers this meant slaves, just as surely as it meant commerce and industry for the Northern fathers. In the protection of this property the Constitution had given recognition to the institution of human slavery, and it was to take seventy-five years to undo that which was accomplished in Philadelphia in 1787.

The founders of the Constitution were great men, great champions of liberty and justice, and far-sighted political theorists. But the members of the Constitutional Convention were also people of their time; limited by the possibilities they could see; prisoners themselves, in a sense, prisoners of the limited understanding they had of the basic equality of whites and blacks. They were prisoners of limited horizons—their own horizons were bounded by the limited horizons they could accept for black people in this new nation.

The Constitution, however, and the laws built upon it, contained a vision of liberty and justice which could not be bounded by the limitations of its time. That vision, that glorious ideal, eventually could not be denied. The struggle between liberty and slavery eventually erupted into the Civil War, and in the aftermath of that war that Constitution itself was amended to recognize the equality and liberty of all which was always inherent in its underlying vision.

It was not that war which freed the slaves; it was not even the Emancipation Proclamation. The proclamation said that "all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State . . . in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free," but it had no effect. It freed only the slaves in the rebellious States over which the Federal Government had no power, and kept in slavery all those slaves under the power and authority of the United States.

Not until 1865, when the 13th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, were all slaves freed. "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude," the 13th amendment said, "shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

"No State," said the 14th amendment, "shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; or shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

And the 15th amendment pledged that "the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

As Julian Bond noted in his Black History Month speech at the Library of Congress 2 weeks ago: "That document, the Constitution, and the laws based upon it, are the basis for the advances in our freedom." Certainly, no one would say that those advances were easy or smooth or rapid. There was a long and hard road from the writing of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to their realization in American laws.

And no one would say that these advances have been completed, finished, or perfected. There remains a long and hard road from where we stand today to the realization of the equality of all races and ethnic groups in all aspects of American life. But the writers of the Constitution gave us a rock on which we could stand, a vision for which we could strive, and ideals with which we could bring forth a nation of liberty and equality for all. For that, we honor them as we honor Black History Month.

THE TRUE SOURCES OF COMPETITIVENESS

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the message from the Discussion Club of St. Louis, MO, to you and to the Members of this House. At the February 18, 1987, meeting of the club, Prof. A.E. Fekete of the Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada, was the invited speaker. In the second part of his address he focused on the true source of competitiveness, which is a strong and stable national currency, making interest rates in the country lower than the rates prevailing elsewhere in the world. The United States had such a currency before

1971. Germany and Japan have such a currency today. Interest is the cost of capital, and it is factored into every single export price. Since interest rates in this country are almost twice as high as the corresponding rates in Germany and Japan, American exports are uncompetitive, and this situation will not change regardless how far the Treasury will drive down the value of the dollar. The competitiveness of the American export industry can only be restored if the dollar is once more stabilized.

The address follows:

THE TRUE SOURCES OF COMPETITIVENESS

(By Antal E. Fekete)

According to Anderson's Law, as long as currency debasement continues, exports tend to fall and imports tend to rise, making the trade deficit grow, rather than decline. Those economists who advocate currency debasement as a cure for trade deficits, arguing that a debased currency makes exports cheaper and imports more expensive, do not understand the market process. They have invented the spurious J-curve and suggest that after an initial drop exports will take off and soar.

The New York Times which has been a devotee of the J-curve for years in advocating the insane policy of currency debasement, had to admit that the letter J stands for the word "Joke." On January 15, it ran the following chart:

[The chart was not reproduced for the RECORD.]

This chart clearly demolishes the J-curve and vindicates Anderson's Law. As Treasury Secretary Baker was crying down the dollar in the foreign exchange markets, American exporters held back, and importers stepped up their activities, making the trade deficit hit a new record in every quarter. Moreover, this was also predictable and the disastrous deficits could have been avoided, if the dollar had been stabilized. It is also predictable that this mindless dollar-bashing cannot go on forever. At one point foreigners will refuse to finance the perpetual outpourings of American deficits. When they cut their losses and run, the dollar will crash and may lose all its remaining value.

There are other voices in the wilderness, carrying the same message. W. Carl Kester and Timothy A. Luehrman, professors at the Harvard Business School, in an article published by Fortune magazine (October 27, 1986) suggest that Germany and Japan—like Br'er Rabbit thrown into the briar patch—may even find their long-run competitiveness enhanced by the dollar's self-inflicted decline. They point out that cheapening the currency can hurt American manufacturers, exploding the old notion that weaker currencies promote competitiveness. They furnish statistics showing how the market share of American auto-makers fell pari passu with the falling dollar, while the market share of the German and Japanese auto-makers grew even faster. They brand the policy of dollar-bashing a failure, and predict that, if continued, it will also fail in the future. At home it squanders the taxpayer's money and fuels inflation as the Fed speculates against the dollar, they say. Abroad, it will create a hothouse nursing our foreign competitors to even greater strength. Unfortunately, the authors fail to make the right conclusion or recommendations. Rather than calling upon the U.S. government to stabilize the dollar, which would clearly level the playing field of

which President Reagan spoke in his State of Union address in January, 1986, they call upon the U.S. manufacturers to exploit the speculative opportunities offered by the policy of competitive currency debasement. There is no substitute for learning how to be 'tricky'.

However, what the Germans and the Japanese know and we don't is not trickery. Like phoenix, the mythical bird, they rose from the ashes of the war, rebuilt their factories, started trading and captured the world's most lucrative markets. That wasn't trickery. They became the world's leading creditors while America was reduced to the position of being the world's leading debtor nation. That wasn't trickery.

What is it that the Germans and the Japanese know and we don't? They know that you can't increase productivity by cheapening the nation's currency. They know that a soft currency is no substitute for hard work. They know that a depreciating currency is poison, and its first victim is he who has concocted it. They know that tinkering with the exchange rates is like tinkering with the thermometer: it won't change the temperature, albeit it may create that illusion.

Interest rates in Germany and Japan are at a level half of ours. How can American producers compete with German and Japanese producers? They can't. And why are German and Japanese interest rates so low, and ours so high? Because people all over the world have confidence in the stability of the German and Japanese currencies, while we are crying down our dollar in the foreign exchange markets.

The debasement of the dollar by beating down its international value can find no possible economic justification. In itself, it weakens one of the necessary instrumentalities for revival, namely, a money which men can trust; a money which men are willing to lend, and lend for long periods of time with the assured confidence that when the debts are paid they will get the same value back; a money in terms of which manufacturers are willing to make future contracts, and which they know they will be glad to have in future payment for the goods they produce. Debasement of the dollar might shock confidence at home and abroad in such a way as to make prices fall rather than rise. It might frighten lenders and investors, it could make everyone more reluctant to extend credit, more anxious to get himself into a safe position. Debasement is harmful and holds no hope for anything but evil.

That we have been forced to a position where we have to consider the debasement of the dollar as a valid policy instrument is both humiliating and alarming. It is a sign that the Administration finds the expansion of Federal Reserve credit insufficient to meet its goals at home and abroad. The prestige of the U.S. government and of the Federal Reserve banks, the good faith of the U.S. government and of the Federal Reserve banks in maintaining the integrity of the dollar is deliberately placed in jeopardy, disregarding the tremendous economic, as well as moral, significance of this dubious course. The preservation of integrity of the currency and the good faith in promises and contracts would be of the greatest economic value to the United States and to the world in the future. But this integrity and this good faith has been undermined by the Administration. The ensuing monetary and moral chaos is appalling.

THE CHANGED CHARACTER OF SPECULATION

The absurdity of devaluation advertised in advance and the absurdity of competitive currency debasement demonstrate the need for fixity in the monetary standard. The economy is not unlike a fast-spinning machine, generating a lot of centrifugal forces. The role of gold in the system is to provide the centripetal force that keeps the machine together. If you remove gold, then you upset the balance between the centrifugal and centripetal forces and this will, in due course, destroy the economy.

The centrifugal force in the economy is speculation. Properly curbed and harnessed, speculation is a benevolent force which helps keep the economy on an even keel. However, the pivotal fact about speculation is that the forces it generates, namely, bull and bear speculation, are not symmetric and not self-balancing. We shall now investigate this asymmetry in two cases: in the commodity market and in the bond market.

In the commodity market the risk carried by the bulls is limited because the price of goods cannot fall below zero. By contrast, the risk carried by the bears is unlimited because there is no a priori theoretical limit above which prices may not rise. This lack of symmetry has far-reaching consequences. It imposes a different behavior-pattern on bulls and bears. Bulls tend to be bolder and more aggressive; bears are more timid and content to be on the defensive. These theoretical observations are borne out by the historical record. A corner is a bull raid on the bears. There is no generic name for a bear raid on the bulls, for the simple reason that such raids have never occurred in the commodity market.

The same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, for the bond market. Here, the risks carried by the bears is limited because the rate of interest cannot fall below zero. By contrast, the risk carried by the bulls is unlimited because there is no a priori theoretical limit above which the rate of interest may not rise. This lack of symmetry in the bond market also imposes different behavior patterns on the bulls and bears. Here, the bears are more aggressive by nature and bulls are relatively more timid.

Yet a symbiosis, a natural ecological balance as it were, is still possible between bulls and bears. Under a gold standard the bears in the commodity market have a chance to resist the bulls effectively. The reason is that commodity prices may not go to infinity—otherwise the price of gold would go to zero. Likewise, bulls in the bond market have a chance to resist the bears. Indeed, bond prices cannot go to zero—otherwise the price of gold would go to infinity. Thus the gold standard provides the only environment where the bulls and bears can peacefully coexist. The gold standard is the only monetary system that can keep speculation in check. In any other monetary system, prices and interest rates show ever wider fluctuations, until the economy succumbs to the destructive forces unleashed by destabilizing speculation.

These theoretical observations are confirmed by the historical record, which shows that every corner ever attempted has failed, as long as the currency was on a gold standard. By contrast, every regime of irredeemable currency in history so far has succumbed to the attacks of bulls in the commodity market, and to the charge of bears in the bond market. In fact, hyperinflation is nothing but a successful corner.

There is no reason to believe that the present reckless experiment with irredeem-

able currency will succeed where all previous experiments have failed. All the seeds of destruction are present. The most ominous aspect of current events is that the Fed and the Treasury feel obliged to play the bears of the bonds market against the bulls of the commodity market, and vice versa. That is, they try to fight high and rising prices by the threat of high and rising interest rates; or they try to fight the deflation created artificially by the regime of high interest rates by the threat of high and rising prices. But you can't ally yourself with the bears of the bond market against the bulls of the commodity market, or the other way round. The fat is that the bulls of the commodity market and the bears of the bond market belong to the same breed, they are ultimately working to the same end, namely, the destruction of the dollar. Thus the program of trying to check price rises by sending the rate of interest into the stratosphere is self-contradictory and is doomed.

The only solution to the dilemma is the return to a gold standard. If the value of the dollar was fixed by statute, then the uncertainty about the future value of the dollar would be removed at one stroke. Interest rates would immediately return to the normal range between 2 and 2½ percent, and would faithfully reflect the marginal productivity of labor and capital in the country. Moreover, prices and interest rates would be stable, due to the restoration of the ecological balance between the bulls and bears. Speculation would be harnessed to keep the economy on track, rather than letting it run amok, causing destruction of productive forces.

Irredeemable currency unleashes all the destructive forces in the body economic. With the return to the gold standard these destructive forces would be eliminated and the energies driving them would be put to constructive uses. We do not need foreign exchange speculation—and there would be none under a gold standard. We do not need gold speculators—and there would be none under a gold standard. We do not need bond speculators or junk bonds—and there would be none under a gold standard. While speculation in the commodity market would still continue under a gold standard, it would be benign and constructive, as there would be a balance between bulls and bears. More importantly, speculation would benefit society directly, for example, it would smooth out undesirable price swings caused by the unpredictable weather and other natural factors influencing agricultural crops.

Competitive devaluations are not the answer to the present crisis of the international monetary system. Each devaluation is a deliberate destruction of values, and it is futile to expect anything constructive to come out of senseless and premeditated destruction. The program of competitive currency debasement is akin to the suggestion that we could all get rich by burning down our homes to collect the fire insurance money.

Enough damage has already been done to the productive system of our society. It is time to stop the destruction, to stop burning down our homes.

It is time to start reconstruction.

REPEAL OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently I reintroduced legislation, H.R. 98, which I have sponsored for the past several Congresses to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act. Enacted in 1931, during the Great Depression, this act was the first Federal legislation requiring the payment of minimum wages to employees working on federally financed construction projects. It was intended to discourage nonlocal contractors from successfully bidding on Government projects by hiring cheap labor from outside the project area, thus disrupting the local wage structure.

During the early years of the Great Depression, unscrupulous contractors were thought to be winning Government contracts by employing itinerant bands of unskilled laborers and paying them exploitative wages. This practice took jobs away from local contractors and resulted in inferior work. For this reason, the Davis-Bacon Act was passed requiring the Secretary of Labor to determine the "prevailing wage" to be paid on federally funded construction projects.

In the 1930's, the need existed to provide a floor beneath the sinking wage rate, as well as to create a deterrent for unscrupulous contractors. However, the Davis-Bacon Act has outlived its period of purposefulness. As construction has matured into a more highly unionized field than American industry as a whole, its wage rates are among the highest in the Nation, thus making the act obsolete. As a result there has been growing support for reform or repeal of its provisions.

Davis-Bacon raises wages on Federal construction projects in two ways. First, it tends to exclude contractors who otherwise would have paid their workers below the rates set by the Labor Department. Second, the administrative procedures for setting prevailing wages may result in artificially high rates, by favoring union over nonunion wages, or by using data from different localities in which wages are higher. The artificially high wage determinations encourage "outside" contractors to bid on Federal contracts at the expense of local contractors. This is contrary to the act's original goal of protecting local labor.

The inflationary impact of this act on the Nation's economy is yet another factor that supports a repeal. The General Accounting Office, the Grace Commission, and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy have each noted the inflationary effects of the Davis-Bacon Act. It significantly raises the cost of public construction at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Among the most significant studies of the act is the 1979 General Accounting Office [GAO] report which recommended repeal of Davis-Bacon. The following are just some of the findings by the GAO study regarding the wage determination process: First, rates used were frequently out of date, or no survey was ever made in the locality; second, survey projects were not always similar to each other

or to the Federal project to which they were applied; and third, rates were extended from urban to rural localities on the basis of jurisdictional coverage in union collective bargaining agreements, or because no other data was available. Its essential conclusion is that the act is difficult, if not impossible, to administer.

The Congressional Budget Office's [CBO] 1983 report on the implications of modifying this act is also important. CBO estimated that the total amount by which Davis-Bacon raises Federal construction costs is about 3.7 percent, or an increase in Federal outlays in excess of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1982. The study suggested that if the Davis-Bacon Act had been repealed in 1983, Federal construction outlays would have been reduced by a total of \$5.2 billion in fiscal years 1984-88.

Given the economic problems we currently face, I encourage my colleagues to join me in my attempt to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this opportunity to commemorate the 69th anniversary of the independence of Estonia. On February 24, 1918, the hopes and desires of the Estonian people were realized with a declaration of independence proclaiming Estonia a free democratic republic.

For the next two decades, peace, prosperity and freedom flourished in this Baltic State. The Estonian people demonstrated what a small nation could achieve under a democratic way of life.

World War II, however, ushered in a brutal era of repression and tyranny. Stalin forcibly incorporated Estonia into the Soviet Union and embarked on an intensive campaign of Russification. While I am proud that the United States has not recognized the Soviet takeover, I am saddened by the fact that Moscow's efforts to completely suppress the Estonian culture continues.

The Kremlin is increasingly trying to eliminate the Estonian language and ethnic traditions. Estonian mores and values are being eroded. Many places of worship have been closed. Religious and political activity is tightly controlled, and any person who expresses a view not sanctioned by the Government is dealt with harshly. A significant number of religious believers and peaceful dissidents continue to be imprisoned, harassed, physically and psychologically abused, and subject to other forms of inhumanity, for courageously bringing Soviet violations to the attention of the world.

Nevertheless, even while enduring these insufferable injustices, the Estonian people have not lost their determination to recover their freedom. They are a brave and valiant people who are destined to enjoy, once again, democratic government.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I have a deep interest in the plight of the Es-

tonian people. The subcommittee will closely monitor Soviet abuses of its citizens and work to help those everywhere who are victimized by totalitarianism. As a free nation, we must continue to support the Estonian people in their struggle to remove the chains of oppression.

Clearly, if recent Soviet gestures toward human rights are to be more than cosmetic, representing permanent fundamental changes in this area, the oppression of Estonia must end, and cultural freedom of this Baltic State must be allowed to flourish in all its dimensions.

DON'T CONFUSE THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY WITH PROJECT DEMOCRACY

HON. ALBERT G. BUSTAMANTE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of Monday, February 23, 1987, which attempts to clarify some confusion regarding the activities of the National Endowment for Democracy. The endowment has nothing to do with the clandestine, "invisible" organization assembled and possibly funded by Lt. Col. Oliver North. We will hear more about the activities of the National Security Council staff when the Tower Commission report is released, but the unfortunate misidentification of the Endowment needs to be rectified. We have worked with the Endowment and have been apprised of their efforts in Paraguay, Guatemala and Haiti. They have always been above-board with us and do not deserve to have their mission misunderstood.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 23, 1987]

AN INNOCENT VICTIM OF THE IRAN SCANDAL

(By Walter F. Mondale and Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Because so much remains unknown about the Iran-contra scandal, information frequently comes out in the form of revelations that may contain only part of the truth and can be badly misleading. If we are not careful, many good and innocent people doing very worthwhile things could be harmed.

A case in point is the recent disclosure that the White House, under the direction of Lieut. Col. Oliver L. North, was carrying out secret activities under something called Project Democracy. According to the report, the project's "public arm" is the National Endowment for Democracy, a private, bipartisan organization established to strengthen democratic institutions in the world.

The allegation that the Endowment has any relationship whatsoever to Colonel North's activities, whatever they were, is entirely unfounded. Even the suggestion that the Endowment is an "arm" of Project Democracy is wrong and clearly at odds with legislative history.

In early 1983, Congress was presented with two separate legislative proposals to foster democratic political and social institutions abroad. The first was Project Democracy, an Administration request for \$65 mil-

lion to fund a range of programs through the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development and the State Department. The second proposal was to authorize funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The Endowment idea was inspired by the success that private foundations associated with West Germany's political parties have had in strengthening democratic institutions in the developing world. As envisioned, the Endowment would be a private, non-profit entity that would openly fund democracy-building programs carried out by institutes associated with labor, business, our two major political parties and other private-sector organizations.

Believing that the work of promoting democracy could most effectively be carried out by the private sector, Congress authorized funding for the Endowment and not the package of programs called Project Democracy. This approach gained the Administration's full support.

This history is important because it shows that from the very beginning Congress placed a high value on the private, bipartisan character of the Endowment and its independence from the current or any future Administration.

Under the leadership of a broadly representative board of distinguished Americans, the Endowment has made great progress. It has developed strong oversight procedures pertaining to the selection, monitoring and evaluation of all grants. It reports fully to Congress on its activities and, as required by statute, keeps the State Department informed as well. The commitment to openness has always been fundamental to the concept and actual operation of the Endowment.

In all cases, the Endowment has been responsive to the democratic needs and initiatives of its partners abroad, in the belief that internally generated change is preferable to change that is artificially imposed from the outside.

The Endowment's work covers a wide range of countries. In the Philippines, Haiti, Taiwan, Guatemala, South Korea, Chile and Paraguay, its programs have supported or are helping to stimulate a process of democratic transition. In developing democracies such as Argentina, Peru and Colombia, as well as in the Caribbean and Central America, it provides aid to groups seeking to consolidate democratic institutions and procedures and to strengthen the commitment to democratic values.

The Endowment is also engaged in the difficult job of encouraging pluralist trends in the closed societies of the Communist world. Even in societies wracked by conflict, such as South Africa, Afghanistan, Northern Ireland and Nicaragua, it supports those who are working peacefully to sustain democratic possibilities and values.

The present controversy only heightens the importance of such open support for our friends abroad. We must not allow totally unrelated activities alleged to have been carried out under the rubric of an otherwise defunct "Project Democracy" to discredit the efforts of the National Endowment for Democracy.

VIKING'S THOR

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some excerpts from a Delaware County Daily Times article of Monday, February 16, 1987, which highlights the achievements of a very successful breeder and trainer of bloodhounds from Springfield, PA.

Mr. Charles Sexton's champion bloodhound, Viking's Thor, became the "first bloodhound in 31 years to win the hound group in the Westminster Kennel Club's dog show at Madison Square Garden. The 111-year-old event is the most prestigious dog show in the world and the second oldest sporting event in the United States." It is certainly a credit to Mr. Sexton to have achieved this honor.

We are grateful to Mr. Sexton for his love of the dogs and the sport, which have given Delaware County a champion to be proud of. On behalf of the Seventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania and myself, I would like to congratulate Mr. Sexton and wish for him continued success.

SOLUTIONS FOR NICARAGUA

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the major foreign policy questions we are facing involves the question of continuing funding to the Nicaraguan Contras in an effort to overthrow the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. On numerous occasions, Congress has been asked to provide military and economic assistance to the Contras. I have opposed these proposals because I sincerely believe that the problems in the region can only be resolved through diplomatic negotiations and through renewed cooperation among the neighboring Contadora nations.

This past December, I participated in the Miami Congressional Workshop on Political, Economic, and Security Issues in the Western Hemisphere. I had the opportunity to meet with Mr. Abraham F. Lowenthal, the executive director of the Inter-American Dialogue and discuss with him the weaknesses inherent in the approach the administration has taken in resolving this conflict. The recent events linking funds received from the illegal arms sales to Iran with funding for the Contras—a violation of the law—raise new questions relating to the viability of this policy. I have cosponsored legislation that would suspend funding to the Contras and I hope that it will be given speedy consideration.

Mr. Lowenthal has written an insightful article which appeared in the January 15 issue of the Los Angeles Times. I wanted to commend his views to my colleagues and urge a careful review of this misguided policy.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 15, 1987]

FACING THE UGLY FACTS ON NICARAGUA—ITS REGIME IS OBJECTIONABLE; WE CAN ONLY MAKE IT LESS SO

(By Abraham F. Lowenthal)

The Nicaragua battle is about to begin again in Washington. Although the issue has been trumpeted as a matter of U.S. security against an extra-hemispheric threat, for five years the fighting has been largely intramural: the Administration vs. Congress, Democrats vs. Republicans. Now, with the Administration in disarray and Democrats in control of both houses, it is time to begin shaping a new and sustainable policy toward Nicaragua. But first, partisans on both sides have to shed their time-worn rhetoric and face some unpleasant facts.

It is undeniable that an unfriendly and undemocratic regime is entrenched in Nicaragua, that it is tightly allied with Cuba and the Soviet Union, and that it is antagonistic to the established order in the rest of Central America. It is also a fact, however, that the present U.S. policy goal of a counter-revolution in Nicaragua has virtually no chance of success.

Aid to the contras was never a sustainable national policy. A policy that could be imposed on Congress only after five grueling debates over a two-year period, and then only by intense White House pressure in an election year, was fragile from the start. It was based on wishful thinking about the political complexion and the military capability of the so-called freedom fighters, and on equally shaky assessments about the Sandinistas. It evolved in bits and pieces, and ultimately it was shaped by the compromises that were necessary to win votes in Washington rather than by hard-headed analysis of how best to protect U.S. interests in Central America.

In theory, support for the contras might have been useful as a means of putting pressure on the Sandinistas to induce flexibility and foster compromise in negotiation. In practice, however, aid for the contras has become a policy of all stick and no carrot; it is not intended to make the Sandinistas more democratic, conciliatory, respectful of their neighbors or independent of the Soviet Bloc, but rather to make them disappear.

But the contra policy is a very weak stick. The United States has been pursuing a military approach without applying enough force to win a military victory. Poking at the Sandinistas with sporadic hit-and-run attacks near remote borders has only made them more repressive and more dependent on their Soviet and Cuban friends.

In any event the contra approach is now a shambles. President Reagan, who could barely obtain congressional permission for the contra policy by dint of great effort when his own standing was very high, is less likely to prevail now that he has been wounded. The Central American countries, whose quiet acceptance of the contras was ambivalent at most, are backpedaling away from them. The contras themselves, whose strategy had been to hang on until stronger U.S. involvement could be obtained, face severe problems of morale. And Nicaragua has hardened; the Sandinistas no longer hide their Marxist-Leninist ideology, and their historic distrust of the United States has understandably deepened.

We can continue to play out a kind of slow-motion Bay of Pigs, but the result of the contra policy is predictable: If we do not intervene directly and militarily, we will be

humiliated. Sensible Americans of both parties agree on the need to avoid this no-win dilemma. They seek an alternative approach.

A new policy toward Nicaragua must address three central issues:

The first is to prevent the introduction into Nicaragua of Soviet strategic facilities, major offensive weapon systems or Soviet or Cuban combat forces—that is, to block the posing of a direct military threat to the security of the United States or of other nations in the hemisphere.

A second key goal is to stop the Sandinistas from providing material support to insurgent movements in neighboring countries—that is, to contain the Sandinista movement within Nicaragua.

Finally, we must make clear that the people of the United States will promote democracy and protect human rights in the Americas, including Nicaragua.

Each of those objectives can be pursued more effectively if the contra policy is shelved.

The Reagan Administration would have solid bipartisan backing for a clear statement, expressed publicly as well as through diplomatic channels, that the United States will not permit the establishment of a Soviet or Cuban military base in Nicaragua—that this country will use force if necessary to prevent the introduction of strategic weapons, major offensive weapon systems of Soviet or Cuban forces.

The second objective, to contain the Sandinistas, should be pursued along regional lines. Washington should make it clear that U.S. troops would help repel a Nicaraguan invasion of one of its neighbors. It is equally important to strengthen the Contadora efforts to reduce the Sandinista arms buildup and to prevent cross-border support for insurgent movements or other attempts to subvert established governments.

The Contadora process—the diplomatic initiative spearheaded by Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Panama—has come a long way toward specifying which activities must be ended, devising surveillance and monitoring procedures to detect them and reversing the regional arms race. Now it is vital that Latin American nations agree to commit their own troops to enforce the proposed regional peace treaties. But Contadora cannot move any further until the United States stops supporting the contras, by far the largest cross-border insurgency operating in Latin America.

The United States, working with others, can also do a great deal to thwart the Sandinistas by working to open up Central America's political systems, curb repression and support social and economic development—and thus deprive Marxist insurgents of potential followers.

The final objective, promoting democracy in Nicaragua, cannot be accomplished at once. The peace and stability of all Central America will be better assured when the whole region is democratic, but democracy cannot be imposed by force.

The best means for promoting democracy in Nicaragua are not the contra forces, themselves of questionable democratic credentials, but long-term peaceful pressures and inducements—like those employed successfully in the Philippines and now being attempted in Chile. Working with the other democratic countries in the hemisphere, the United States should consistently push for human rights and democratic openings. Washington should work with the Catholic Church and other nongovernment organiza-

tions, emphasize media and diplomatic pressures, and isolate the repressive regimes of the hemisphere, both internally and internationally.

In time, persistent multilateral pressures should lead to Nicaragua's becoming not the first domino, but rather one of the last in a hemisphere-wide turn toward democracy. Nicaragua is not in Eastern Europe; as Nicaragua's democratic forces grow, the Soviet Union will be unable to repress them from afar.

There is no quick-fix solution for Nicaragua—no easy means to bring about a peaceful, democratic and congenial regime there. With a sense of perspective and some patience, however, the United States could still adopt a sound policy toward that end. It is surely high time to try.

AN INNOCENT VICTIM OF THE IRAN SCANDAL

HON. JOHN R. MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a lengthy article in the February 15 New York Times represented the National Endowment for Democracy as the overt arm of alleged secret operations and initiatives carried out by the National Security Council staff under the rubric "Project Democracy." Although the Times did not establish even a vicarious connection between the endowment's programs and the NSC staff's activities, it suggested, if not implied, that a link existed.

In fact, no such link exists, and the Times was mistaken in assuming even that the endowment and Project Democracy share so much as a common origin.

In the Monday, February 23, Times, Vice President Walter Mondale and Republican National Committee Chairman Frank Fahrenkopf, Jr., former and current members of the endowment's board of directors, replied to the earlier article. I wish to commend their column to my colleagues' attention, since it corrects several inaccuracies in the earlier article.

The article follows:

AN INNOCENT VICTIM OF THE IRAN SCANDAL

(By Walter F. Mondale and Frank J. Fahrenkopf Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Because so much remains unknown about the Iran-contra scandal, information frequently comes out in the form of revelations that may contain only part of the truth and can be badly misleading. If we are not careful, many good and innocent people doing very worthwhile things could be harmed.

A case in point is the recent disclosure that the White House, under the direction of Lieut. Col. Oliver L. North, was carrying out secret activities under something called Project Democracy. According to the report, the project's "public arm" is the National Endowment for Democracy, a private, bipartisan organization established to strengthen democratic institutions in the world.

The allegation that the Endowment has any relationship whatsoever to Colonel North's activities, whatever they were, is entirely unfounded. Even the suggestion that the Endowment is an "arm" of Project De-

mocracy is wrong and clearly at odds with legislative history.

In early 1983, Congress was presented with two separate legislative proposals to foster democratic political and social institutions abroad. The first was Project Democracy, an Administration request for \$65 million to fund a range of programs through the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development and the State Department. The second proposal was to authorize funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

The Endowment idea was inspired by the success that private foundations associated with West Germany's political parties have had in strengthening democratic institutions in the developing world. As envisioned, the Endowment would be a private, non-profit entity that would openly fund democracy-building programs carried out by institutes associated with labor, business, our two major political parties and other private-sector organizations.

Believing that the work of promoting democracy could most effectively be carried out by the private sector, Congress authorized funding for the Endowment and not the package of programs called Project Democracy. This approach gained the Administration's full support.

This history is important because it shows that from the very beginning Congress placed a high value on the private, bipartisan character of the Endowment and its independence from the current or any future Administration.

Under the leadership of a broadly representative board of distinguished Americans, the Endowment has made great progress. It has developed strong oversight procedures pertaining to the selection, monitoring and evaluation of all grants. It reports fully to Congress on its activities and, as required by statute, keeps the State Department informed as well. The commitment to openness has always been fundamental to the concept and actual operation of the Endowment.

In all cases, the Endowment has been responsive to the democratic needs and initiatives of its partners abroad, in the belief that internally generated change is preferable to change that is artificially imposed from the outside.

The Endowment's work covers a wide range of countries. In the Philippines, Haiti, Taiwan, Guatemala, South Korea, Chile and Paraguay, its programs have supported or are helping to stimulate a process of democratic transition. In developing democracies such as Argentina, Peru and Colombia, as well as in the Caribbean and Central America, it provides aid to groups seeking to consolidate democratic institutions and procedures and to strengthen the commitment to democratic values.

The Endowment is also engaged in the difficult job of encouraging pluralist trends in the closed societies of the Communist world. Even in societies wracked by conflict, such as South Africa, Afghanistan, Northern Ireland and Nicaragua, its supports those who are working peacefully to sustain democratic possibilities and values.

The present controversy only heightens the importance of such open support for our friends abroad. We must not allow totally unrelated activities alleged to have been carried out under the rubric of an otherwise defunct "Project Democracy" to discredit the efforts of the National Endowment for Democracy.

TRIBUTE TO POLICE HERO FRANK LaSALA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, each year our Nation loses some 150 law enforcement officers in the line of duty. This year, it appears, will be no exception. It is with a deep sense of loss and utmost respect that I rise today to pay a special tribute to one of law enforcement's fallen heroes—New York City police officer Frank LaSala.

On January 10, Francis (Frank) LaSala, a 12-year veteran of the New York City Police Department, died from injuries he suffered during a heroic rescue attempt. Emergency Service Officer LaSala rushed into a burning building across from his stationhouse in an attempt to help about a dozen people escape the fire. Tragically, Officer LaSala collapsed on a third floor landing when he was overcome by a blast of smoke and flame. He suffered second- and third-degree burns over 55 percent of his body.

This totally selfless and courageous act by Officer LaSala epitomizes so much that is good about the law enforcement profession. Perhaps more than anyone else, it is the law enforcement officer who has the greatest appreciation and respect for human life. How else can we explain the fact that police officers so often risk, and sometimes lose, their own lives for people they do not even know? Some might respond that it's their job. But, as one police survivor is quick to point out, "Police officers don't get paid to die."

No, Officer LaSala did not rush into that burning building because that's what he gets paid to do. He did it because he is a very special type of person; someone that isn't afraid to risk his own life to help others in distress. No doubt, that is why people who knew Officer LaSala described him as: "Extra special—a one-of-a-kind sort of guy."

Another person described Officer LaSala this way in a recent letter to the New York Daily News:

The funeral ceremonies are over, and except for family and close friends, life's routines resume. But I want to remember Frank LaSala for one more day. It was only a short time that I knew him, but I was struck by his kindness, honesty, vitality, and ability to laugh. He would do anything for anyone, and so gave his life. A better police officer or person will be very hard to find.

What makes people like Frank LaSala and so many other heroic law enforcement officers do what they do? Perhaps, Charles Frohman explained it best when he was sinking to his death aboard the S.S. *Lusitania* in World War I and supposedly uttered, "Why fear death? It is the most beautiful adventure in life."

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER ON THE ABM TREATY DEBATE

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the current debate over the proper interpretation of the ABM Treaty reminds one of the old joke that if you placed all the lawyers in the world end to end they would point in different directions.

Columnist Charles Krauthammer, in the following column, deftly cuts to heart of the ABM Treaty controversy. "Only the United States," Krauthammer writes, "would turn its strategic future over to lawyers." In fact, this mistake was first made in 1972, when the State Department and ACDA lawyers on the United States arms control delegation sat across the negotiating table from the Soviet General Staff members on the Soviet arms control delegation. Such an asymmetrical situation could hardly have produced an equitable agreement that was in the U.S. national security interest.

Krauthammer proposes a solution, which I have also suggested in a letter to the President. That is, utilize article XV of the ABM treaty, which permits U.S. withdrawal from the treaty on 6 months' notice. Article XV makes the SDI opponents see red, but they cannot claim it is ambiguous or subject to varying legal interpretation.

The United States is a nation of laws with a long tradition of strict compliance with international legal obligations. But these high standards afford little protection against international outlaws like the Soviet Union. A similar situation existed in the 1930's, when Tojo's Japan and Hitler's Germany began to chafe under the League of Nations strictures and the Treaty of Versailles. Japan simply withdrew from the League of Nations after invading Manchuria, and Germany renounced the Treaty of Versailles in order to build her illegal war machine. The rest is history. I highly recommend Mr. Krauthammer's column to my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1987]

ABM vs. SDI

(By Charles Krauthammer)

There is a story, no doubt too good to be true, that W. C. Fields was found reading the Bible on his deathbed. Asked what he was doing, he replied: "Lookin' fer loopholes." The Reagan administration, in similar health, has sat down with the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, a document less uplifting but far richer in ambiguity. And in an obscure addendum, it thinks it has found salvation.

Most of the world understands the ABM Treaty to prohibit testing, development and deployment of, well, anti-ballistic missiles. So did the Reagan administration, until October 1985. Now the administration, wanting to do advanced testing for the Strategic Defense Initiative, has found a loophole. Agreed Statement D allows testing of ABM systems based on "other physical principles" than those known when the treaty was signed in 1972.

This loophole opens up on some exotic casuistic corridors. What exactly are "other

physical principles"? Most people understand that to mean Star Wars stuff, like lasers or particle beams, which are based on directed energy principles. It is odd, therefore, that what the administration seeks to test under a "broad" interpretation of the ABM treaty is a system that shoots projectiles at Soviet missiles and destroys them on impact. The "physical principle" at work here is kinetic energy (hence the name: "kinetic kill vehicles"). Kinetic energy was known in 1972. It is the physical principle that underlies the bow and arrow.

Which leads the Pentagon lawyers to respond that the new physical principle is not in the shooting down, but in the picking up: i.e., the sensing mechanism. In 1972, ABM systems used radar to pick up their target. Today's SDI sensing mechanism is optical or infrared.

Is this what "other physical principles" means? God knows. The question of what a treaty permits depends on many factors: the treaty negotiating record (i.e., what the United States and the Soviet Union thought they were agreeing to); the ratification record (what the Senate thought it was agreeing to in 1972); subsequent practice (the behavior and claims of the two parties: the treaty's "case law"). The record on all counts is exceedingly muddy.

The whole exercise is another depressing triumph of American legalism. (With a fine irony: regarding the ABM treaty, liberals are the upholders of "original intent," while conservatives are the "judicial activists"—a neat switch of their usual positions.) Only the United States would turn its strategic future over to lawyers. Perhaps that is why we turn out nearly as many lawyers as engineers: our treaties need as much work as our cars.

In fact, the real argument has nothing to do with the words "other physical principles." It has to do with the spirit of the ABM treaty and the meaning of SDI. The ABM treaty sought a strategic arrangement under which both sides renounce defenses in the belief that mutual vulnerability makes for stability and deterrence. SDI seeks invulnerability. These are inherently contradictory ideas.

So long as SDI was pie in the sky, one could live with the contradiction. Less than 18 months ago, Secretary of State George Shultz pronounced the debate over the two treaty interpretations "moot." State Department legal adviser, Abraham Sofaer, testified before Congress that "the issue may have practical significance only when the SDI program has reached the point at which . . . engineering development, with a view to deployment, become a real option."

The administration now believes the option is real. It is forcing reinterpretation of the treaty because it now knows where it wants to go with strategic defense. It wants partial and immediate—meaning by the early 1990s—deployment of a kinetic energy system based on existing technology. That system is now busting to get out of the lab. It will soon be ready for full-scale engineering development.

But you can't do that under the ABM treaty. Up to now the engineers have had to make do with what the lawyers call "sharp practices": skirting the edge of the treaty by performing experiments that are deliberately downgraded and distorted to stay within the letter of the law.

This makes for the worst of both worlds: distorting both the treaty and the SDI pro-

gram. It leads to absurdities such as occurred during the latest "Delta 180" SDI test. An antiballistic device picked up a rocket fired from Earth and tracked it, but when it came to shooting it down, the ABM had to turn around and crash into a different satellite. Shooting down the rocket would have been a violation of the treaty.

The SDI wizards, both legal and technical, are running out of sharp practices. Enter the "broad" interpretation.

It is an unfortunate move. The administration should have the courage of its convictions. If it really wants to deploy SDI, it should drop the Jesuitical exegesis and act unambiguously within the terms of the ABM treaty: withdraw. The treaty permits withdrawal on six months' notice. Such a move would have the virtue of focusing the issue. We could then have a real debate on a real question: which conception of deterrence makes more strategic sense, that offered by SDI or by the ABM treaty? An honest debate on principle is better than a slither through the loopholes. Unfortunately, slithering is easier.

MISSOURI'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE HATCH ACT OF 1887

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1987

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, this body has approved a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887, and its role in establishing our Nation's system of State agricultural experiment stations. I congratulate this body for that action and I commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. DE LA GARZA for his work on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also make mention of a chairman of the agriculture committee from long ago, William Henry Hatch, the father of and the namesake for the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887.

Congressman HATCH served in this House during eight sessions, representing northeast Missouri, much of the area I now represent in this House. In fact, Congressman Hatch is buried in my hometown of Hannibal. He served ably his constituents, never losing sight of the importance of agriculture to his district and to his Nation. Apparently it was this devotion to agriculture that propelled Congressman Hatch to the chairmanship of the Agriculture Committee in a relatively short period of time.

For several years prior to enactment of the Hatch Act there had been much talk and deliberation about establishing an experimental farm station system in this country. But then, as now, budget constraints seemed to dictate policy, including farm policy. There were other problems such as jurisdiction, mission and bickering between rural and urban forces. It took the determination and skills of Congressman Hatch of Missouri and the new Secretary of Agriculture, Norman Colman, also of Missouri, as a matter of fact, to bring the forces together and succeed in passage of the legislation. For his leadership in forging this consensus, something that had been attempted

since as early as the 1860's, Hatch was honored by his colleagues in having the act named for him.

And what has the Hatch Act of 1887 produced? We now can look proudly at a national network of farm stations that is consistently on the cutting edge of new agricultural technology. And I am proud that my State is solidly entwined in that network. Missouri has 19 such experimental stations with at least half of those in my district.

Again I commend the House of Representatives for passage of this resolution that so justly rewards the father of our Nation's system of State agricultural experiment stations, Congressman William Hatch of Missouri.

BRAVE NEW WORLD OF ANNUAL REPORTS?

HON. JOSEPH J. DiOGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DiOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, last week, I read an interesting article in the Wall Street Journal explaining new and innovative changes that we may see in the annual reports of American corporations. I would like to bring this article to the House's and the American public's attention, and ask unanimous consent to include it in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 10, 1987]

BRAVE NEW WORLD OF ANNUAL REPORTS?

(By Edward Kulkosky)

The annual report we have come to know and hate is deadly. Oddly, the assassins are General Motors Corp. and the Securities and Exchange Commission, plus a few co-conspirators.

This is good news, U.S. corporations are now free to reinvent and, one hopes, improve the annual report as a result of ruling by the SEC. From now on, companies can use the reports to convey any truthful message that suits them. If they choose, they can even eliminate the annual report altogether.

The fact is, there has never been a rule that requires publication of an annual report, at least in its familiar form. Regulations require only that corporations provide certain specific information to shareholders each year, usually just before the annual meeting. Annual reports have customarily fulfilled this requirement.

Now the SEC explicitly says that if the information requirement is met in some other way, companies can do as they please with what it refers to as "glossy annual reports," provided the information they include does not conflict with what is filed in their 10K reports to the SEC or their proxy materials.

The ruling by the SEC was informal and has not been widely publicized. General Motors, in a December letter to the agency, proposed to publish a summary annual report and to meet the formal information requirements separately. It said it would issue a press release with full audited financial statements; include audited financial statements in its 10K; and repeat them in

its proxy materials along with other required information.

GM also said in its proposal: "Since [the annual report] would no longer be used in any SEC filings or proxy mailings, it could be dropped entirely. However, we believe that it has value as a general communications medium to our stockholders."

The SEC wrote back a month later that it has no problems with the proposal. Realizing the broad implications, it decided to make the exchange of letters a matter of public record. Linda C. Quinn, the SEC's director of corporation finance, says she expects the word to spread as reporting services used by lawyers and accountants publish the letters.

The SEC position is not just a matter of hair-splitting over obscure rules. If anyone realized beforehand the traditional annual report was optional, nobody at the SEC or in the corporate world ever said so.

The Financial Executives Institute, the national trade organization for corporate financial officers, has long been pushing for summary annual reports to improve readability, and the SEC has been studying the possibility but has had reservations about procedure. It feared that condensed financial statements would be substituted for full statements, thereby violating the rules. Under GM's approach, however, full disclosure would not be sacrificed because complete financial statements would be provided in other places. The SEC's acquiescence breaks the mental logjam and allows corporations to think of their annual reports in new ways.

The SEC's approval is good news for GM because it prints some two million glossy annual reports each year and stands to save a substantial sum by producing a smaller report. The GM proposal is an outgrowth of its participation in a research project on summary annual reports conducted by the Financial Executives Institute and Deloitte, Haskins & Sells, the accounting firm.

It's also good news for the many investor-relations people who have been trying to do more effective jobs in communicating to the public the investment merits of their corporations. Annual reports have all too often looked backward instead of forward, ignoring the fact that expectations attract investors, not ancient history. And in today's electronic world, where a corporation was at a time perhaps four months ago is indeed ancient history.

Is it also good news to investors? Yes, but with an important exception.

Professional investors depend more on the 10K than the glossy, and individuals spend no more than a few minutes with the annual reports they receive.

Small wonder. Even a generous observer would concede that no more than a few hundred reports are worth any more of the investor's time. That's out of some 10,000 published by public companies in the U.S. One of the reasons is that many companies feel bound by tradition to turn out the same kind of report year after year. It's as if they are saying, "We and our competitors have always turned out lousy annuals and we aren't about to change now." The exchange of letters between GM and the SEC shatters the myth that there is anything mandatory or sacrosanct about the traditional glossy annual report.

The one drawback is that those corporations that are innately taciturn, through indifference or design, may use the new freedom as a way to say even less, dumping their disclosure documents into the 10K,

press release and proxy materials and issuing nothing that provides perspective on where the company is headed or how it intends to get there.

On the positive side, once the word spreads that the myth has been shattered, we believe many corporations will unleash a lot of pent-up creativity and invent a better glossy report. Inevitably, the reports will become the province of communicators and not accountants or lawyers. And that should be good for companies and investors alike.

The 19 summary annual reports produced by participants in the Financial Executives Institute project sharply reduced the number of pages of financial statements, typically from 22 to 10. Otherwise, there were three approaches. One group made no other changes. Another condensed the narrative as well, but kept all the same sections. A third made significant contents changes, such as moving footnote material into the narrative; using graphs more generously; and rewriting the financial review in layman's terms.

Here are possibilities for the future:

Some companies could use the budget for their annual report to upgrade their quarterlies, resulting in rolling annual reports that provide a better sense of continuity.

New media such as floppy disks and videotapes could become more common as substitutes for or supplements to the glossy.

Under the influence of video, designers could develop graphics techniques depicting the company as a process rather than frozen in a moment of time.

Tradition is powerful, and drastic changes aren't likely to happen overnight. Sooner or later, though, the annual report game will be a brand-new one, and we'll all owe the SEC and General Motors a debt of gratitude.

A TRUE PICTURE OF THE PROBLEMS IN RURAL AMERICA?

HON. JIM LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, the recent series of Senate Agriculture Committee hearings in the Midwest stirred once again the cry that everything in rural America is going under.

Not all reporters, however, chose to follow the committee formatted testimony.

Craighton Knau, farm director for KMA Radio in Shenandoah, IA, is one who felt compelled to check on the accuracy of some very emotional statements made at the hearing.

Mr. Knau, a respected farm editor, graduated from Iowa State University, and operated a feed business before entering into farm broadcasting. He not only has the expertise of a professional broadcaster but the experience of losing a business. He knows well what he speaks.

The following is a copy of his broadcast on Saturday, February 21, 1986:

Here in the midlands the citizens have been subjected to a highly emotional four to five years. Almost everyone has been touched in one way or another *** even those who are making it and those who are beginning to see a small pinpoint of light at the end of the tunnel have experienced

having to make some major and moving changes in their lives. Volumes of words have been written *** reels of tapes have been recorded *** and vast cartridges of film have been exposed about the changes and the why of the changes.

Because of the sophistication of today's communications and the preservation of records, this current condition of mid-America will be more cataloged for the historians than any in the history so far recorded. But *** of what has happened and is happening has witnessed some words that have not been well chosen. Some of what has been said for the record has actually played against the necessary actions to assist in bringing the present situation to a more swift conclusion and better times for those involved.

When the Senate Agriculture Committee held official sessions here in the midlands recently, a good share of the reason for the sessions was political posturing for the elections coming up in less than two years. As a result, most of the presentations were from the negative side, paying no little attention to those who have struggled with decisions and changes necessary to survive. Those positive decisions and actions should be shared so that others may benefit *** they should not be hidden in the zealous attempt to benefit politically. During the rhetoric before the committee, there were statements made concerning large increases in tragic trends in individuals' lives *** such as alcoholism, use of drugs *** an increase of persons taking their own lives as a final solution to their personal problems. That last implication *** the indication of an increase in suicide *** kind of bothered me. As a consequence *** I called by phone and talked with the county coroners in two of the counties in Iowa represented by those presenting their testimony to the Senate Agriculture Committee *** these people would certainly have records of such tragedies *** but I didn't find any indication of what was presented to the Senators *** these county officials to which I spoke and asked questions were frankly surprised to the purpose of my call *** some personal tragic actions were recorded during these past few years *** certainly *** there always are *** but not to the extent as was indicated. When words are spoken about any subject *** they need to be well chosen *** I'm Craighton Knau.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 24, 1987

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, February is Black History Month, a time set aside to recognize the role of blacks in America, both past and present. We take this time to review not just the accomplishments of our black citizens, but also as a reminder of the need to remain vigilant in the battle against racial discrimination.

Just as the hostility faced by blacks is unique, their triumph is unparalleled in American history. They have risen to become leaders in all fields of human endeavor, persevering in a system that neither nurtured nor encouraged their talents.

One such leader was Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr. of Baltimore, MD. Before Clarence Mitchell

became the lobbyist for the NAACP in 1950, there had not been any major civil rights legislation passed since Reconstruction. In the ensuing years, in his role as the "101st Senator," Clarence Mitchell oversaw the passage of major civil rights legislation including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968.

The Washington Post said of him, "His life's work, inspiring those who shared his hopes and eventually persuading almost all of those who hesitated, profoundly changed and uplifted the nation." Mr. Mitchell's work was recognized in 1980 when President Carter granted him the Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest civilian honor. Clarence Mitchell's life enriched both his hometown of Baltimore and the entire country.

And yet this month we look back on the history not only of blacks but of our society as well. We must assess the strides we have made toward racial equality and recognize the challenges unmet. The incidence of poverty among blacks remains both appalling and unacceptable. While the battle against discrimination in law has had its successes, we certainly have not eliminated discrimination in fact.

As we face the work ahead we are inspired by the words of the late Dr. King who said, "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Thus, in infringing on the rights of blacks we endanger the rights of all Americans. And by impeding the progress of blacks we impede the progress of America.

Let us instead continue the fight to open the doors of opportunity to all of our citizens. Our resolve to act should heed Clarence Mitchell's declaration, "Once it has been established that certain wrongs exist, I think it's useless to complain unless you intend to do something specific about it." Black History Month is the time to recognize racial injustice and reaffirm our commitment to do something about it.

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS COVERAGE ACT

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining many of my colleagues in introducing legislation to provide Medicare beneficiaries protection from the devastating expenses of catastrophic illness. I commend the President for forwarding this legislation to Congress and I am pleased to lend my support. The Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act represents an important first step in covering the acute care hospital and physician expenses that over 1 million elderly and disabled may experience in any 1 year.

While I recognize the obvious benefits of this legislation, I think it is worthwhile to delineate its potential shortcomings. Most importantly the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act will help to provide the elderly the security of knowing that a devastating illness will not deplete the family's total resources. The act sets a limit on beneficiaries total out-

of-pocket expenses for Medicare covered services at a level of \$2,000 per year. Once this maximum amount is reached, the beneficiary will receive 100 percent Medicare coverage for unlimited days in the hospital, up to 100 days in a skilled nursing facility [SNF]—if Medicare medical necessity tests are met—and for physician services. In addition, the act makes several changes to the current Medicare Program. It removes beneficiary cost-sharing requirements for hospital and SNF stays and limits the number of hospital admission deductibles to a maximum of two per year.

The President's bill utilizes the Medicare Program to provide the catastrophic benefit. For this reason, the monthly cost to the beneficiary will be a minimal amount which will be added to the Medicare part B premium. The catastrophic portion of the premium and the limit on out-of-pocket expenses will be indexed to account for inflation, increases in program costs, and to maintain budget neutrality. Intentionally, this pay-as-you-go system of financing should result in no additional Federal expenditures which would further exacerbate the deficit.

This is not perfect legislation and several amendments may be necessary to assure the budget neutrality of the program. First, consideration should be given to separating the catastrophic benefit from the part B program and establishing an individual catastrophic plan which will be required by law to be self-financed. Our experience with the Medicare part B program should teach us how quickly program costs expand. When the part B program was established, it was financed equally by premiums and general revenues. As the costs of the program grew, the premiums remained stable. Only 25 percent of the part B program funds are now collected from premiums. In addition to separating the program, it is also important to place some controls on utilization of services. The bill as drafted would allow unlimited payments for physician and hospital services once the \$2,000 limit is met. A managed care system should be established to assure that beneficiaries receive only necessary and appropriate health care services.

As a supporter of the concept of full Medicare coverage for catastrophic illness, I want to provide this program with the assurances necessary for its longevity and solvency over time. With Federal deficits at their current high levels, a self-financed program is the only responsible Federal option available. I believe my constituents understand this and are willing to purchase the benefit to minimize their long-term risks. As the Congress begins to evaluate the President's proposal, it will be important to more closely determine the cost of the benefit, including Federal expenditure under the Medicaid Program, and the numbers of beneficiaries who will utilize the catastrophic benefit. With these cost components fully disclosed, an actuarially sound premium can only then be determined.

The Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act represents an important first step in addressing a fundamental gap in health insurance protection. The legislation will benefit from further fine-tuning. I plan to work with my colleagues in addressing the areas of concern

I have mentioned, and I continue to be open to further reforms. This country's elderly population deserve and should expect a program that can be sustained over time. We owe our constituents a solvent health insurance program for catastrophic illness.

DE MINIMIS DUTY ON KIWIFRUIT

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation which would place a de minimus duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound on imports of kiwifruit.

California is in the process of developing a kiwifruit industry. There are currently an estimated 1,000 growers in California who account for over 98 percent of the U.S. production. Until recently, imports of kiwifruit primarily from New Zealand, helped to supply the domestic market during the domestic growers' "off season." Recently, however, these imports have been significantly expanded and have begun to overlap domestic production and marketing.

In 1982, for example, over 4 million pounds of kiwifruit were imported from New Zealand. During 1985, imports of kiwifruit from New Zealand totaled over 17 million pounds. This dramatic surge in imports and market penetration has depressed domestic growers' prices in the market.

The surge in imports of kiwifruit is of concern because it is believed that the New Zealand Government subsidizes exports of kiwifruit to the United States.

Domestic growers should have the opportunity to compete on an equitable basis with imports.

This legislation, by setting a de minimus duty, would recognize the problems of surging imports and the difficulty agriculture has had historically in seeking relief from the ITC. It should be noted that historically there has been a duty on imported kiwifruit. The duty was removed on the basis that imports were small in volume, relatively high in price, and not directly competitive with any domestic product. The situation has changed dramatically with the development of a domestic industry and with the New Zealand subsidy programs.

WDST STRIKES A BLOW FOR ARTISTIC FREEDOM AND CRE- ATIVE BROADCASTING

HON. MATTHEW F. McHUGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the community of Woodstock, NY, which I am privileged to represent in Congress, has long been known as a center of creativity in the fine arts. In recent years, it has become the home of an outstanding radio station—WDST-FM—which has consistently won awards for the quality of

its innovative programming. The station's creativity reflects the dynamic and enthusiastic leadership of owner Jerry Gillman and his wife Sasha—as evidenced by a recent broadcasting breakthrough which has international implications.

Vladimir Feltsman, a world-renowned Soviet pianist, had found his career in limbo after applying in 1979 for permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel. His concerts were canceled, his recordings suppressed. But recently the station WDST classical programmer, Leslie Gerber, had unexpectedly come upon several rare Feltsman recordings, one of them originating at a private concert at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. Thanks to Jerry Gillman's persistence by letter and phone, not only did WDST feature a full concert program of the Feltsman recordings, but the program featured a special telephone interview with Feltsman from his Moscow apartment, an interview facilitated by the State Department and our Moscow Embassy.

This broadcasting coup by WDST was thereafter shared with more Americans when the New York Times' radio station WQXR rebroadcast the program in its large listening area. But even more dramatic a consequence of the WDST broadcast was the fact that it was used by the Voice of America for a special series of broadcasts to the Soviet Union. During periods of relaxed jamming at the Soviet end, such broadcasts can reach an audience of 275 million people!

Thanks to the initiative of Woodstock's station WDST, the irrepressible artistry of Vladimir Feltsman was shared with millions of people in the Soviet Union as well as in the Northeastern United States. If efforts by the State University College in New Paltz, NY are successful, Mr. Feltsman will hopefully be able to participate in an exchange program that would bring him to the United States for a long-awaited visit.

I am pleased to share with my colleagues two newspaper articles that detail the story of WDST's broadcasting coup.

[From the Ulster County (NY) Townsman,
Jan. 15, 1987]

VOICE OF AMERICA TO BROADCAST WDST PROGRAM TO THE SOVIET UNION

Voice of America has asked permission to re-broadcast a WDST program on Soviet pianist Vladimir Feltsman which included an interview of the dissident concert artist as well as rare recordings suppressed in the USSR. V.O.A. plans its first program to be broadcast to the Soviet Union Sunday, February 1st, and will schedule three additional programs, to be broadcast by V.O.A.'s Russian Branch, in anticipation of possible Soviet jamming of V.O.A. when the Soviet dissident is heard in interview.

Voice of America Russian Branch programming is heard by 275 million people in the Soviet Union when broadcasts are not jammed. When jamming occurs, 29 million people are still able to hear the broadcasts, according to a Purdue University professor who is a specialist in international radio broadcasting.

WDST, Woodstock's independent FM station, originally asked State Department assistance in setting up the Woodstock-to-Moscow telephone interview of Vladimir Feltsman by classical programmer Leslie Gerber. Mr. Gerber had come into posses-

sion of two rare, Soviet-suppressed recordings: a Chopin Concerto and two Kabalevsky Concertos, one with the composer conducting. WDST wanted to air them along with a telephone interview of Feltsman but checked with the State Department for advice on whether such an interview might jeopardize Feltsman's chances ultimately to get out of the Soviet Union. Charles Redman, the State Department spokesman, and replacement for Bernard Kalb, cleared the proposed interview with the Soviet desk in Washington and then by telephone with Ambassador Arthur Hartman in Moscow.

The suppressed recordings which came into Mr. Gerber's possession are identified only as "recorded 1984" but were actually made at the United States Embassy in Moscow at a concert by Feltsman before an invited audience. The original WDST program which included the rare recordings and the telephone interview of Feltsman was aired in November 1986.

During the telephone interview, Mr. Gerber twice asked Vladimir Feltsman if he envisioned any likelihood of eventual Soviet permission to emigrate. On both occasions, Mr. Feltsman answered that he anticipated no possibility of permission being granted. Once Feltsman asked permission to emigrate along with his wife Anna, a biologist—some five years ago—the Soviets stripped him of concert work. He no longer plays in metropolitan centers and when he does play, he says, it is sometimes on pianos with missing keys. He plays only in remote cities and villages. During the interview, Mr. Feltsman explained background notes as his children playing. He lives with his wife and children in a one-room apartment in Moscow.

In 1982, Vladimir Feltsman was booked into Avery Fisher Hall at Lincoln Center. The event was widely publicized and was to be his American concert debut. Internationally prominent artists formed a committee to appeal to the Soviet Union in Feltsman's behalf. Members of the committee included Leonard Bernstein, Zubin Mehta, Pinchas Zukerman, Yehudi Menuhin, Daniel Barenboim, Dudley Moore and many others whose names are household words. Their appeals went unanswered.

WDST's all-Feltsman program will also be re-broadcast by WQXR, The New York Times-owned classical station in New York City and Voice of America has advised that branches other than V.O.A.'s Russian Branch are interested in the program, as is the United States Information Agency.

WDST, known as The Bulldog of the Hudson Valley, is the only station in the United States three times to win Billboard's Station-of-the-Year Award. It regularly airs rock, jazz, blues and talk programming, in addition to classical, in its eclectic schedule.

[From the Poughkeepsie (NY) Journal, Jan. 23, 1987]

THE BULLDOG . . . AND THE BEAR—WOODSTOCK'S WDST-FM CHAMPIONS THE CAUSE OF RUSSIAN CONCERT PIANIST

(By Florence Pennella)

Because of the perseverance of Jerry Gillman, general manager of radio station WDST in Woodstock, Soviet dissident and pianist Vladimir Feltsman may be on his way to playing on a piano that has all its keys.

In 1979, Feltsman, who is Jewish, asked permission to emigrate from Russia to Israel. In response, the Soviet government stripped him of his concert work. He plays

occasionally, in remote cities and villages, and when he does, the pianos he plays sometimes are missing a few ivories.

Feltsman discussed his situation in an exclusive interview with WDST in November, an interview that involved the combined efforts of WDST's Gillman; Leslie Gerber, the classical music programmer for WDST, and the United States Department of State.

WDST aired the two-hour program Nov. 16 and portions of it will be broadcast by Voice of America on February 1 to various geographic areas of the Soviet Union. The purpose of the broadcast is to "help the cause of Vladimir Feltsman and others who are fighting for their right to live and work in freedom," wrote Natalie Clarkson, chief of the Russian Branch, Voice of America, in a recent letter to Gillman.

Feltsman started his career in his teens. At age 15 he won first prize at the Concertina International Competition in Prague and when he was 19 he won first prize at the Marguerite Long International Competition in Paris.

A graduate of the Moscow State Conservatory, Feltsman toured the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe extensively, giving piano recitals and appearing as soloist with orchestras. He toured Japan in 1977 and France in 1978. Feltsman was grounded six years ago when he applied for an emigration visa to Israel.

The only recording of Feltsman's music currently available in the United States is one CBS Masterworks made from a 1984 concert Feltsman gave at the United States Embassy in Moscow at the invitation of American Ambassador Arthur Hartman.

The Feltsman/WDST connection began in September 1986 with Gerber, owner of Parnassus Records, a mail order house in Saugerties specializing in rare or out of print classical recordings. One-third of his business is from clients overseas—"rich Arabs and rich Japanese," Gerber says.

This past fall, on a routine visit to one of his suppliers in New York City, Gerber found a Spanish-made tape of Feltsman's music, recorded in 1965 when Feltsman was 13.

"I grabbed it," Gerber said. "The record dealer didn't know what a jewel he had."

A few days later, Gerber received a package of records from a client/supplier in the Soviet Union. The package contained an LP of Feltsman's music recorded in the Soviet Union in the 1970s.

"It was phenomenal to get two recordings of Feltsman's music within one week and I didn't pay much for either," Gerber said.

Gerber's acquisition of the Spanish and Russian recordings of Feltsman playing was a find.

"I called Jerry at WDST and told him I thought we should do a whole program of Feltsman's music," Gerber said. "Jerry wanted to go one better. He said let's try to interview Feltsman."

Gillman, a writer, and his wife Sasha started WDST in 1980, a feat that proved Gillman has the tenacity of his bulldog Montagu, the station's mascot.

It took Gillman seven years, a ton of paperwork and numerous filings with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to get approval for his FM station in Woodstock.

So he was ready to take on the job of arranging a phone interview with Feltsman in Moscow.

"I called the United States Department of State in Washington, D.C. and was referred from one person to another," Gillman said,

"I was told I had to talk to Charles E. Redman, spokesman for the department and Bernard Kalb's replacement. I thought with the Iranian/Contra arms deal, Redman had enough to do without trying to arrange the Feltsman interview. But it was Redman who paved the way."

The Feltsman/WDST hookup was aired on Nov. 16, with Leslie Gerber as host.

Gerber is used to celebrities. Through his classical music business he's met a lot of famous people. He is also a celebrity of sorts. Many tourists, especially from Japan, stop by and visit him in his house, "Big Pink." "Big Pink" was once home to The Band, Bob Dylan's first back-up band.

But interviewing Feltsman was humbling, Gerber said.

"Feltsman was gracious, friendly and unpretentious. We talked about his music and his situation and how he hopes he and his family will eventually be permitted to leave the Soviet Union. I wish the best result for him."

The Feb. 1 Voice of America broadcast of the WDST/Feltsman interview should help the artist's cause, as should Dr. Alice Chandler's visit to Moscow this week.

The SUNY New Paltz president traveled to Moscow on Wednesday with a group of American academic leaders and plans to meet Nobel Laureate Dr. Andrei Sakharov and his wife, Dr. Elena Bonner, during her three-day visit. The association with Sakharov is through their mutual friend, Dr. Edmond Volpe, a physicist and president of the College of Staten Island, who is also traveling to Moscow.

In that meeting, Chandler will propose an exchange program in music where Russian-born musician Gundaris Pone, who oversees SUNY New Paltz's Music in the Mountains series, will perform American contemporary music in Russia. In exchange Chandler will suggest that Feltsman be permitted to travel to the New Paltz campus and perform contemporary music of Russia.

"The political climate in the Soviet Union seems to be changing," Chandler said last week.

"The exchange program I am proposing is in the spirit of reciprocity."

A CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO JOHN OLGUIN ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1987, the Cabrillo Marine Museum is honoring John Olguin on his retirement. It is indeed an honor to pay tribute to John Olguin on his 50 years of unselfish and extraordinary service to the Cabrillo Marine Museum and the community.

A native of San Pedro, John Olguin has dedicated his life to the city. After graduating from high school John served 3 years in the services during World War II, receiving the Silver Star for gallantry in action. He then returned to Cabrillo Beach to serve as a lifeguard from 1937 to 1948, remaining lifeguard captain until 1962.

In 1949 John Olguin was given the responsibility as serving as acting museum director

as well as lifeguard captain and playground director. In his new position of acting museum director John began school programs for area children and under his direction the museum was selected as one of the 15 outstanding education programs by the American Association of Museums. By 1953 he was appointed museum director and served until 1973 when he was made program director. He proceeded to become associate director of Cabrillo Marine Museum in 1976.

During his years at the Cabrillo Marine Museum, John created many programs besides the school program. In a nutshell, he started a grunion program, and an educational program at the museum; a whalewatch program; he conducted workshops; and fought for a project (and won) that made the tidepools adjacent to the museum a refuge.

Mr. Speaker, John Olguin has served our community for the past 50 years through his dedication to the Cabrillo Marine Museum. He has managed to make this museum much more than a museum, but also a social and educational resource for our area.

My wife, Lee, joins me in commending and congratulating John Olguin on his retirement. We wish him and his wife, Muriel; their children Monica, Viola, and John, and the grandchildren Micah, and Raniya success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO JACK H. OLENDER, ESQ.

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend and pay tribute to Mr. Jack H. Olender, Esq., a man who has for 25 years practiced law in our Nation's Capital.

As principal trial lawyer in the firm of Jack H. Olender & Associates, P.C., here in Washington, DC, Mr. Olender specializes in cases of alleged medical malpractice. Representing damaged children in obstetric and pediatric malpractice and other catastrophic injury cases, Jack Olender has built a reputation of effective merging of compassion and professional expertise.

While the path Mr. Olender has chose to pursue has afforded him the opportunity to live a successful life, his success has never prevented him from being involved in programs that contribute to the improvement of the quality of life for a wide variety of people in the District of Columbia.

I would like to submit the following proclamation by the Mayor of the District of Columbia, Hon. Marion Barry, Jr., who officially proclaimed February 18, 1987, as Jack H. Olender day in Washington, DC. I am also providing Mr. Olender's acceptance speech which was delivered before an audience of more than 200 friends, colleagues, and family members.

I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the life and achievements of a man whose thorough understanding of the law, fine grasp of the legal system, and compassion for his fellow man, makes him a fit subject for our admiration and praise.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on Wednesday, February 18, 1987, special recognition will be given to Jack H. Olender in honor of his distinguished service rendered to the residents of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, Jack H. Olender is currently principal trial lawyer in the firm of Jack H. Olender and Associates; and

Whereas, Jack H. Olender became a member of the District of Columbia Bar in 1961, and has served in several other capacities which include being a member of the U.S. Supreme Court Bar, a member of the Inner Circle Advocates, Certified Trial Advocate, and Diplomate of the American Board of Professional Liability Attorneys; and

Whereas, Jack H. Olender is constantly working to improve the standards of trial practice, the administration of justice, and the ethics of the trial branch; and

Whereas, it is fitting that we set aside time to salute this outstanding citizen for his high standards of professionalism:

Now, therefore, I, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim Wednesday, February 18, 1987 as "Jack H. Olender Day" in Washington, D.C. and call upon all the residents of this great city to join with me in honoring this outstanding citizen.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF JACK H. OLENDER

Mr. Mayor, Dear and Distinguished Friends: I am deeply grateful for the honor of this day. As I look around this magnificent hall, I am reminded of many things.

Much has changed in Washington in the 25 years since I came here as a young lawyer. This city has grown tremendously. There has been restoration—as we can see here—redevelopment and a rebirth of spirit.

But, as you know, although there have been significant strides in civil rights over the last quarter century, we must be ever vigilant. Human rights must be constantly restated and reasserted to remain alive.

And while we move toward racial harmony, we must not forget other important guarantees that constitute the body of our civil rights. When a wrong is done—when harm is inflicted on a blameless citizen—he or she must have free access to the courts, and the benefit of trial by jury to remedy that wrong. This cherished right belongs to everyone regardless of race, sex, age or class.

In this year of celebration for our Constitution, we must not forget the role of law. Indeed we are a nation made strong by the rule of law. Our legal system is unique in the whole world for the extent to which it protects the rights of the individual.

While it is true that the law occasionally shifts to meet the needs of our society, we should always remember that its spirit does not change. Although some would have us believe otherwise, the law as it stands was designed to guide and protect the public—we the people—not commercial interests. The rights of the individual citizen always come first.

With your help and good will, I will continue to work toward that end.

I thank you.

ADMINISTRATION PROMOTES POSITIVE EXPORT CONTROL LAW CHANGES

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I note with great pleasure that the administration's competitiveness package contained some needed changes to our export control laws. While Congressman AuCoin and I have introduced an export control package which provides more critically needed reforms, I am pleased that the administration has begun to respond to some of the problems caused by the current export control system. Those problems have been dramatized by a recent National Academy of Science study, which describes our system as one of complicated, unnecessary restrictions, overcontrols. NAS says that system has cost American businesses billions of dollars in lost sales each year and has not provided any additional national security protection.

The administration's proposal includes, first, the extension of distribution licenses covering exports to the People's Republic of China; second, improvement in foreign availability laws by setting deadlines for foreign availability assessments; third, a deadline on approval of export licenses of 20 days for items that are available and not controlled in other free world countries; and fourth, a resolve to improve the system to multilaterally negotiate controls, especially to reduce U.S. unilateral controls and to ensure that items are removed from the International Control List.

I would also commend the administration for its other initiatives to reform our export control laws to improve the competitiveness of our high technology industry. Secretary Baldrige has expedited certain sales to our CoCom allies, including the elimination of re-export controls within CoCom nations. Consideration is also being given to establishing a de minimus level for U.S. content in foreign produced equipment which would eliminate re-export controls on products made abroad which contain a small percentage of U.S. goods or technology. There is concrete evidence that re-export controls here have definitely denied the sale of many U.S. parts and components to foreign manufacturers.

I commend the administration for these initial reforms of export controls and urge it to continue. The quickest fix for the trade balance is to restore competitiveness by removing inane, ineffective restrictions to American exports.

Very few legislative actions can have such a prompt, positive impact on our trade deficit as the rationalization of export controls, the National Academy has confirmed the worst suspicions of American industry. Our export control system is a gaping self-inflicted wound. We can treat that wound without reducing our security at all.

CHEAPER TELESCOPES AND RIFLESCOPES

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation which would increase the availability of a wider range of quality imported telescopes and riflescopes to the American public, at substantially lower prices. This objective would be accomplished by authorizing duty-free entry of certain of these optical instruments in a way that would not adversely affect the domestic industry. This legislation would separate imports of the products on the basis of price, with duties on lower priced imports eliminated while tariffs are maintained on higher priced instruments that might compete directly with U.S.-made goods.

Specially, this bill proposes the riflescopes valued at not more than \$50 be allowed to enter the United States without payment of duty, with those valued at more than \$50 continuing to be subject to the prevailing 20 percent ad valorem tariff. Similarly, telescopes valued at not more than \$200 would enter duty-free, while those valued at more than \$200 would continue to enter at the current 8 percent ad valorem rate.

AN INTERNATIONAL RESPONSE FOR DIPLOMATIC SECURITY

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today which seeks the cooperation and support of other nations in establishing an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations.

Since the 1980 hostage crisis in Iran, the number of international terrorist incidents has increased dramatically. Robert Oakley, Acting Ambassador at Large for Counter-Terrorism, testified recently in front of a House Judiciary Subcommittee that there were more than 800 incidents of international terrorism in 1985, resulting in 2,223 casualties, of which 23 were killed and 139 of the injured were Americans. According to Ambassador Oakley, over the past 2 years, international terrorist incidents have risen sharply—60 percent—from the yearly average of about 500 incidents for the 1979-83 period.

The State Department has taken the lead within the Government by establishing a Bureau for Diplomatic Security under an Assistant Secretary that has overall responsibility for security of U.S. citizens and facilities overseas. The Bureau includes the Diplomatic Security Service which as initiated an extensive, multiyear program to strengthen the security for embassies and foreign service personnel worldwide. The new Bureau is primarily responsible for overseeing a massive diplomatic security enhancement program overseas with funds approved under the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorism Act of 1986.

While the United States and our closest allies are working together to prevent and to combat international terrorism directed toward our diplomatic personnel, the U.N. members are in need of an international consensus and commitment for protecting foreign diplomats. This is what my concurrent resolution seeks to do. It expresses the sense of Congress that the President should seek the support of other nations for the establishment of an International Office of Diplomatic Security within the Secretariat of the United Nations to monitor compliance by all nations in protecting personnel and missions. This office would work with each country's government to ensure that all diplomatic corps receive adequate protection from the spread of international terrorism.

The State Department has negotiated several international conventions designed to increase international cooperation against terrorism. Yet these conventions largely deal with the prosecution of punishment of known terrorists and are not designed specifically to unify and protect all diplomatic missions through the United Nations' worldwide mechanism. An International Office of Diplomatic Security would provide a realistic framework for nations to cooperate with each other against the brutality of terrorism.

THE AMERICAN WAY

HON. WES WATKINS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a man, a constituent of mine, who, I think, exemplifies the best of what is good about the United States of America. This Nation was founded on ideas and the implementation of those ideas.

Mr. Harland C. Stonecipher saw a need, took the idea, and developed it into a thriving business which has not only filled that need, but it has also provided protection for others while providing employment and income for hundreds of people.

With all due respect to the profession of law, which is a noble profession, our colleagues must have noted increasing incidents of legal actions including damage suits. Almost no one in these days is immune from a possible law suit and, with more and more legal actions being filed, each return of a jury or a jurist's verdict brings awards for damages, real and punitive, running in the thousands and sometimes millions of dollars.

We are all familiar with the cases which have been popularized and, I suspect, the issue itself polarized by intense media coverage. This coverage in itself I suspect in turn leads to more and more suits being brought.

Harland Stonecipher several years ago became aware of this growing problem and established the Pre-Paid Legal Services, Inc., in my hometown of Ada, OK. Simply put, Pre-Paid Legal Services can be likened to Blue Cross and Blue Shield and other health plans coverage, only the services provided, instead of being health care and medical services, are legal services. Most of us, in the hopes that we don't need health and medical care, pay

monthly or yearly premiums to those firms of our choice which, in turn, when medical bills come due, pay at least of the charges stemming from health problems we might develop.

Mr. Stonecipher saw the need, from time to time, for the advice and counsel of the legal profession. But, rather than having heavy and unmanageable expenses at one time, Mr. Stonecipher developed the idea of having a premium which, in time of need, would pay for the required legal services.

He has established the corporation and now is authorized to operate in many States. In fact, stock in his firm is now one of the many fine companies represented on one or more of the stock exchanges.

Harland Stonecipher's idea has provided safety for those who have subscribed to his service, created jobs for those who work for his firm, and also benefit the legal profession by paying their fees.

Mr. Speaker, I commend him and his entrepreneurship to you and my colleagues.

BATTELLE RECEIVES AWARD FOR INNOVATIVE HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY

HON. AL SWIFT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress renewed and strengthened this Nation's commitment to cleaning up hazardous waste by reauthorizing the Superfund Program. I was pleased to author a provision of that bill that established the Pacific Northwest Hazardous Substance Research, Development, and Demonstration Center, the purpose of which is to come up with alternative and innovative technologies for cleaning up hazardous waste.

The center will be operated by Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories, under the leadership of Dr. William Wiley, and will use facilities in Richland and Sequim, WA. I recently visited the Sequim facility, and was impressed by a new waste treatment process that Battelle has developed called in situ vitrification.

The in situ vitrification process solidifies hazardous waste into glass by inserting electrodes into contaminated ground. When electrical current is passed between electrodes the soil and rock melt, forming a block of glass resembling natural volcanic obsidian. The hazardous material is destroyed or contained in the glass.

In recognition of Battelle's innovative accomplishment, the National Society of Professional Engineers last month named the process one of the outstanding engineering achievements of 1986. In making this award, the society considers technological originality and innovation, importance to industrial development, fulfillment of human and social needs, and application of known and new engineering principles. Individual credit for inventing the process goes to James L. Buelt, William F. Bonner, and Richard A. Brouns, all of whom are on the Battelle staff.

In situ vitrification could have widespread application for the permanent cleanup of haz-

ardous waste sites, not just in the Pacific Northwest, but throughout the United States. It is an exciting development, and it shows Battelle's potential for even more important technology development at the new Pacific Northwest Hazardous Waste Research, Development, and Demonstration Center.

COMMENTS OF JOHN A. LUKE

HON. BEVERLY B. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the remarks of Mr. John A. Luke, the president of Westvaco Corp. As a leading producer of quality paper products, Westvaco continuously works to improve productivity and efficiency in a market that grows more competitive every day.

In a recent speech, Mr. Luke announced Westvaco's decision to make a capital investment of \$200 million in its mill located in Luke, MD. This mill has been an important source of progress in western Maryland for many years. The community is delighted that Westvaco has taken steps to ensure continual modernization and improvement of the mill. Westvaco is committed to the advanced production of premium quality paper products, and its investment in Luke Mill will certainly contribute to that goal.

Mr. Luke's comments with regard to the competitiveness of American industry and our position in world trade are particularly pertinent as we head into a revamping of this Nation's trade policy. The remarks of John A. Luke follow:

REMARKS OF JOHN A. LUKE

Good morning, and welcome to each of you as our distinguished guests and as our special friends. We are honored by your presence.

I am always very pleased to return to this community, and I am particularly so today. Bringing a very positive announcement about the future of our Luke mill gives special meaning to the day as it represents another key step in the progress of this unit for which all of us have worked so long and so hard.

Before I make that announcement I want to talk about the reality of competition in today's world, and share some strongly held views on what it takes to contend with it.

The last ten years have been ones of real difficulty for a number of major American industries and for the regions where they are located. The problem has arisen not because foreign competition is fundamentally superior, but from the fact that these troubled industries lost their former competitive edge and, it seems, their competitive spirit and determination. The three counties in which we are located, Allegany, Garrett, and Mineral, and our two states, Maryland and West Virginia, have each felt the impact intensely.

Competitive spirit and determination are what built this country. They are the essence of our free enterprise system which is the heart of this country's standard of living and the envy of all the world. The free enterprise system, however, is also a very stern and demanding taskmaster. It rewards only success, and it imposes hardship

as the penalty for those who falter under its pressure. Fortunately, though, for every failure within the free enterprise system, there are also at least as many successes. It is a dynamic process where the only sure and consistent winner is our country.

In retrospect, there seem to be good explanations for what has happened in steel, auto, and textiles. First and foremost, they may not have thought that what has happened could ever happen to them, and so they fell into a state of competitive complacency. Their costs grew, and their productivity suffered. They didn't modernize; they didn't focus on their markets. Their competitive edge withered. And beyond the control of these industries, a similar lack of attention to competitive position also occurred on a national basis. As a country, we didn't take world competition seriously. And, we didn't pay attention as the value of the dollar against other world currencies grew beyond reason. Our government overlooked the vital importance of the dollar and our gates opened to a flood of imports while the gates to other countries were effectively closed. The result of these joint industrial and government failures was that a large portion of basic American industry was brought to its knees.

None of these things had to happen, and those portions of industrial America and our Administrations of the '70s and early '80s have to accept the responsibility for their failures. Let's always remember the lesson of just how fragile competitive position really is. It can be here today and gone tomorrow, taking with it jobs and economic health.

In the paper industry, the picture is different in many, but not all, respects. Here is an industry that has never had the false luxury of competitive complacency. Rather, throughout its history, it has always had intense foreign and domestic competition, and this is one of its great strengths. Competition has been a stimulant for constant investment in modernization, innovation, and market focus, to the point where the products of this industry are generally world competitive. Here is a basic American industry that has been doing its job in terms of maintaining its competitive position against the best world competitors—Japan, the second largest paper producer in the world; Canada; Germany; Scandinavia; and Brazil and other developing countries. The paper industry is a part of the same basic American or smokestack industry as are steel and autos, but paper has transformed itself into modern and high-tech smokestack industry.

A moment ago I used the words "generally world competitive" and I want to amplify that phrase. First, the paper industry was badly hurt when the value of the dollar grew excessively against other currencies. It is not immune to such devastating lapses of attention. Second, while essentially all of the industry's products could compete in a fundamental sense in most of the world's markets, and despite the Administration's success in weakening the dollar against a number of foreign currencies, the reality is that foreign trade barriers including currency relationships do prevent certain products from being truly competitive. The packaging grades of paper are better able to compete in world markets, but fine papers, such as the ones made here at Luke, are very much less able to do so. Printing papers made in the U.S. do not find their way into the world market nearly as readily as foreign imports enter the U.S. market.

The facts are that other countries have protective barriers to safeguard their paper

industries while imports of paper into this country are practically without duty or restriction. The result is that American fine papers are largely foreclosed from the international market; while here at home, these papers compete against virtually duty-free and subsidized imports of foreign paper. More than five times as much fine paper is now imported into the U.S. as is exported from it. The fundamentals do not justify this. It is surely not fair trade.

Third, there is relatively new and increasing flow of paper from some of the developing countries, such as Brazil, which probably has the lowest costs in the world. We know firsthand about the cost of production in Brazil because we have operations there. We don't produce printing papers here, but we know they are very low in cost and of good quality. Brazilian printing paper is entering this country in important quantity.

Up to now, I have stressed foreign competition only because it is a newer force in terms of its impact, not because it overshadows domestic competition in either ability or intensity. Domestic competition is even more rigorous and relentless. To put the U.S. paper industry in perspective, it is the world's largest and most efficient. It has big mills, staffed by very able, innovative, and determined organizations, and it makes quality paper at low cost. It is "world class" in every respect, and its discipline is the very factor that has enabled its participants to cope as well as they do with foreign products.

There are several more things I want to say about competition, and these relate to what it takes to compete in today's world. Things that are basic to what we, together, as a company and as a community, will be setting out to do here at our Luke mill. As a community and as a mill, we each have separate, but also very interrelated roles and responsibilities. In my view, there are at least five essential, even absolute, requirements for competitive success today.

First, a clear strategic plan to which all can relate. We have one, and I will describe it shortly.

Second, a winning attitude combined with world-class skill. This means championship performance, and nothing less, by each of us in every aspect of our work. It means precision, and it means attention to every single detail because the difference between success and failure is normally very small.

Third, investment—the ability and the willingness to commit major financial investments and human energy for state-of-the-art process, equipment and product, and for the research and development to point the way. In our capital intensive industry, these investments are long-term, they are at full risk, and there are no guaranteed outcomes beyond what we ourselves can achieve. It is our responsibility to make success happen.

Fourth, an innovative and committed organization at all levels which both welcomes and also initiates change for competitive advantage, from work practice to product design, and an organization which is equally dedicated to superior product quality and the most advanced customer service.

The Luke mill's recent contract settlement is illustrative of these vital characteristics. The agreement is very competitive—fair and appropriate both ways. While I very gratified, I am genuinely not surprised that the Luke work force so accurately read competitive reality and endorsed this contract without reaching for noncompetitive rewards. I will say categorically that this

agreement played a very important role in the announcement I will shortly be making. It demonstrated, again, a quality of employee judgment which creates high confidence and on which a sound future can be built. We are committed as a company to competitive wages and benefits, but this commitment can only be met when it is wholeheartedly coupled with the most advanced and efficient work practices.

And fifth, community support beyond the commitment of our own organization. We rely heavily on the genuine commitment of our community, and, in my book, community means local, county, and state. I was very positively impressed by your response to two things I called for in a speech I made a few years ago here in Allegany County. I said then that to invest and compete, we needed open, competitive bidding in our construction contracts and that we also needed competitive property tax treatment for our investments. Your response was swift and sure on these two matters, just as it was earlier when you rose up to protect the mill from the imposition by the EPA of extreme and very noncompetitive environmental standards for sulphur dioxide. Your support in these matters was a key element in today's announcement.

It is imperative, both locally and at the state level, that the direct costs of taxation, as well as the range of indirect costs, both legislative and regulatory, never go beyond competitive levels. We cannot afford handicaps beyond those borne by our competitors elsewhere, because the margin of commercial success is simply too narrow. We do not ask any special advantage; we ask only that you support us with a level field on which to compete.

On a national basis, we are for a tough-minded and determined attitude by our government on international trade. Not, and I stress this, protectionism in any way, rather free and completely fair trade in which currency relationships are appropriate and in which other barriers and subsidies are never less than equal, or better yet, completely nonexistent—a truly open world market where the best product value can prevail on its own merit. I endorse the Administration's growing and forceful determination toward this end.

Finally, and in essence, at each level—local, county, state, and national—we need your constant backing and commitment—strong home town support. So often in tough competition, home fan support—and that's the powerful magic of home field advantage—is the decisive and winning edge. We fully accept that, as your team, our performance must continually earn your respect, but in return, we need to know you are totally with us when we are on the field.

We have invited you to be with us today so that we could announce a major capital program and explain as well, with clear supporting reasons, just what it takes to make such a program successful for both Westvaco's shareholders and this region.

People respond to competitive challenge in different ways. Some retreat, and others rise to it. Westvaco is in the second group. We are competitors in the true sense. It is said in the world of sports that the "best defense is a good offense." In other words, put the challenge to your competition. This is true, as well, in the world of business, and it describes Westvaco's philosophy very accurately. It is this spirit which is at the heart and soul of the program we are announcing today.

Our announcement is that Westvaco is going to make the largest single capital in-

vestment in its history here at its Luke mill. It will be \$200 million, and construction will be complete in 1990. While the work to be done will heavily affect almost every department, from the pulp mill, to the paper mill, to the finishing and customer service facilities, the program is fundamentally product driven. Our objective is to focus the mill, even more than now, on the premium portion of the fine paper market, with products of unique and very advanced design. We will concentrate on the development and production of papers that others will find very difficult to duplicate. In fact, our new products are intended to obsolete virtually every product that the mill is now making.

I want to say very forthrightly at this point that our plans do not contemplate increased mill employment. Competitive strategy in today's world calls not for larger work forces, but for even greater efficiency and productivity without additional personnel. Our program is designed to significantly strengthen the competitive position of the Luke mill, and this should mean improved economic health and security for the mill, its employees, and this region. We expect this new investment to strongly reinforce the \$200-million-dollar annual economic impact which the mill now has in this community. An ever stronger Luke mill is tremendously important to Westvaco's future, and it is my belief that it is equally important to the future of this area.

Our construction program will be major in both scope and duration, and it will create the need for some 2,000 construction workers. Rather than being new construction in an isolated area, essentially all of the work will involve existing equipment and facilities right in the heart of our operations. It will take skillful planning and even greater adaptability and cooperation between the mill and construction organizations to get the job done while the paper mill continues to serve its customers reliably and with outstandingly good products.

There will be a new bleaching line and other changes in the pulp mill. Each of the mill's five paper machines will undergo major reconstruction in support of their new products. There will be major and varied additions to those finishing processes which prepare the product for market and assure precise and timely customer satisfaction. Overall mill production will grow by about 15 percent, but additional capacity is less of an objective than is product strategy. We do not believe that being larger provides a guarantee of success. We do believe that there is much greater potential in being better and in making products which have special value.

Our decision to invest \$200 million at Luke is a very carefully considered and enthusiastic commitment of both capital and confidence in this region. It is, as well, a major extension of the vigorous and steady program of modernization which we have carried on here for the past thirty years. We believe deeply in our ability to compete effectively in today's world. All of the ingredients for success are right here, and we look forward with determined confidence. Westvaco is dedicated to the challenge, and we ask for, and count on, your equally forceful commitment—the type of commitment that has always characterized the Luke mill organization and its community.

Thank you very much again for joining us today. We believe there is an exciting future ahead!

CUTS IN HEALTH PROGRAMS SHOULD BE REJECTED

HON. MARILYN LLOYD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1988 calls for deep cuts in health programs which I believe have already borne far more than their fair share of budget reductions. The proposed \$9 billion in Medicare and Medicaid cuts represent, disproportionately, nearly one-third of the administration's total deficit-reduction proposal. The biggest single cut—\$4.7 billion—would come from Medicare, the \$70 billion-per-year program that provides health coverage for some 30 million elderly Americans. The administration is also proposing to cut \$1.7 billion from the Federal share of Medicaid, the program that provides health care to some 23 million low-income Americans—many of whom would be hard pressed to obtain care if not for this much needed program.

About \$1.3 billion in savings would come from the imposition of a \$25.4 billion cap on the Federal share of the program. A Federal cap would force already hard-pressed States either to reduce benefits or come up with additional money from their own treasuries—many of which are now being stretched to the limit. The Department of Health and Human Services estimates the increased State share at \$1.3 billion, but the Congressional Budget Office said the cost to States would be closer to an astonishing \$3.2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, these proposals are simply not affordable to the State of Tennessee whose residents depend greatly on Medicare and Medicaid services. The cost of health care is already exorbitant and I am concerned that the enactment of such measures would only heighten what is already a crisis for many in obtaining adequate care and treatment. We in Congress must not tolerate the administration's attempts to eviscerate these basic health care programs upon which so many vulnerable Americans depend. I urge my colleagues to join with me in rejecting the administration's budget so that we can enact legislation to ensure the availability of quality health care for all Americans.

INSIDER TRADING

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Justice Department have recently taken a number of well publicized enforcement actions for trading on insider information. These actions raise questions about the adequacy of Federal laws proscribing insider trading, especially in view of the assertion in a recent Business Week magazine article that "insider trading is not the exception, its becoming the rule."

Access to inside information—information that is not known publicly and that will affect the value of a company's stock—gives an elite group of greedy securities investors and their accomplices the opportunity to make gigantic profits. The loser, of course, is the average investor, who must make investment decisions without the benefit of the inside information. If the integrity of, and public confidence in, the stock market are to be maintained, there must be tough Federal laws on insider trading.

The committee on criminal law of the association of the bar of the city of New York has carefully studied Federal law dealing with insider trading. The committee found that "the present statutory basis for both civil and criminal insider trading liability, the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, does not directly address trading on nonpublic information, and proscription of such trading is dependent on SEC rulemaking under the act's general antifraud provisions and judicial application of those antifraud laws and rules to insider trading. While this may be an acceptable manner in which to impose civil liability for insider trading—although even that is open to question—we believe it is a wholly inappropriate basis for imposing criminal liability. Criminal prosecutions should be based on a reasonably specific statute identifying the conduct that is prohibited." To remedy the deficiency in Federal criminal laws, the committee recommended a new insider trading statute.

I am today introducing that proposal as the "Insider Trading Prevention Act of 1987." This bill will be the vehicle through which the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, which I chair, will examine insider trading. The subcommittee will want to determine if it agrees with the association's committee on criminal law that present Federal criminal law is inadequate. If the subcommittee does find that current law is inadequate, the subcommittee will have to determine whether the "Insider Trading Prevention Act of 1987" does what needs to be done.

Hearings on the legislation will begin in the very near future. I invite all persons and organizations interested in testifying to contact the subcommittee.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend and extend for 3 additional years at such sums the Native American Programs Act. This bill is identical to one passed unanimously by the House and Senate during the 99th Congress and then vetoed by the President on September 26, 1986. The act was established to provide for the awarding of grants and contracts to help American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and native Hawaiians achieve social and economic self-sufficiency. The program recognizes all native Americans including those living on and off reservations in rural or urban settings.

The bill contains several provisions designed to strengthen the program and to provide more accountability to its operation. First, the Administration on Native Americans would be required to establish by regulation their administrative peer review process. The peer review panel will rank the applications in order of their relative merit and submit them to the Commissioner. The Commissioner will then award grants based on the peer review panel's recommendations. In those instances where he chooses to exercise his discretionary power and deviate from the list he simply must make a written record explaining why he did so and transmit it along with the rankings to the Congress. The bill would further require that any proposed changes in policy, program or application requirements made by the Administration for Native Americans be made through the regulatory process, including printing in the Federal Register for comment.

The new provisions are designed to build on the Department's already established procedures and make the program responsive to the needs of native Americans. They represent what Congress feels is a mandate to ensure stability and proper bureaucratic action. Establishment of a formal peer review panel will promote an equitable grants competition, while the new publication requirements will continue to foster the special government-to-government relationship shared by native Americans and the Federal Government.

Last year, the administration had 6 months to formulate a position on the bill. Their opinion was not forthcoming and the Congress proceeded with toward final passage. At the 12th hour, as Congress was on the verge of recess, we were presented with a list of changes demanded by the administration. There was no opportunity for compromise.

Throughout the consideration of the legislation, I have offered to work to reach a meaningful accommodation. Indeed, the peer review process contained in the bill is itself an alternative to the appeals process requested by many in the Indian community.

Hopefully, the last few months have given all interested parties an opportunity to better understand the intent of these amendments and the rational approach they embody. As always, I remain open to thoughtful and constructive suggestions that take into account the needs of the native American community and the improved effectiveness that can result from ensuring them the same meaningful opportunities to comment afforded in other Federal programs.

REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, Estonian Americans commemorated the 69th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia. Here is yet another example of the people dispossessed of their homeland by the Soviet regime.

Estonians are a proud and independent people who were brutally subjugated under

Stalin. We in America must not be allowed to forget the suffering and humiliation of a country that once stood among the free nations of the world. Let this commemoration of Estonia's brief independence stand as a symbol of solidarity for all Americans against the oppression and inhumanity practiced by the Soviet Union.

The absorption of the Baltic States of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia by the Soviets is a story of human suffering that shames the pages of history. The League of Nations gave full recognition to Estonia in 1922, making it a part of the international community.

In 1940, Soviet troops in direct contravention of international law, crossed the Estonian border and put an end to the universal suffrage, 8-hour workdays, land reform, and basic human rights once enjoyed by the Estonian people. In their program of subjugation the Soviets shipped thousands of Estonians in boxcars to slave labor camps within Siberia, where these individuals faced a Holocaust of their own.

Although courageous individuals fought a desperate campaign of resistance, the Soviets installation of a puppet government signaled the end of Estonian independence. The Soviet Union dictated a harsh program of agricultural collectivization in the Baltic region that resulted in the death, deportation, and starvation of hundreds of thousands of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.

Today the Soviet Union continues to pursue a program of brutality toward these people. Estonians are being subjected, by the Soviets, to systematic cultural revision and historical disinformation, designed to destroy their own national identity. This program of stripping away Estonian cultural identity is supplemented by attempts at populating Estonia with persons from other areas of the Soviet Union. In our modern society ethnic diversity is something which every person should cherish as a source of pride and individuality. Soviet policy toward this region seeks to methodically destroy the identity of a people.

Let the captivity of Estonia serve as a constant reminder to the free world that the Soviet Union still violates human rights in ways that should shock the conscience of mankind. Even today most Western nations refuse to accept the Governments of these three Baltic States as de jure.

Mr. Speaker, the fate of Estonia is mourned most deeply by its own residents who cannot publicly recognize the demise of the freedom they once held. All Americans should join these people in the fervent hope that one day Estonians may again enjoy the blessing of liberty in their own native land.

INTRODUCTION OF THE MER- CHANT SEAMEN'S BENEFIT ACT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation, entitled "The Merchant Seamen's Benefit Act", to recognize those

few remaining merchant seamen who repeatedly placed themselves in "harm's way" during the hostilities of World War II. This legislation will provide the recognition that those oldtimers deserve in their own right—a recognition that is not available under existing laws.

During World War II, the losses suffered by our merchant marine were staggering. What is not well known is that 733 U.S.-flag merchant vessels were lost in all theaters of operation. Thousands of merchant seamen were injured or disabled; 609 spent time as prisoners of war or civilian internees; and 5,662 were killed or missing in action. Their mortality rate of 2.8 percent is just insignificantly less than the 2.9 percent loss ratio suffered by the U.S. Marine Corps and significantly more than the loss ratio suffered by all the other armed services combined. Still, to this day, the United States remains the only major maritime nation that has not recognized merchant seamen who contributed greatly to a successful war effort.

Many of us can recall—and others have read about—the days in 1942 and 1943 when our merchant shipping was being brutalized by enemy submarines operating close to our shores. We can recall the battle of the Atlantic and our efforts to resupply Great Britain, France, and our other European allies. We can recall the relief convoys that traveled the treacherous Murmansk route to resupply our Russian allies. We can recall the Pacific campaigns and the support missions that were conducted by a proud and ever-present merchant marine. I, personally, remember seeing hundreds of vessels anchored off City Island, New York—an area I presently represent—preparing for convoy duty for the crossing of the Atlantic. San Francisco, other west coast ports, and many gulf coast ports were likewise crammed full with merchant vessels and merchant seamen ready to risk their lives in the war effort. We must never forget those dedicated individuals who sailed into the darkness of the unknown with little or no protection. It is now most befitting for this grateful Nation of ours to recognize the valiant efforts of those few remaining merchant seamen.

Our merchant seamen have manned our merchant ships since the creation of our Nation. Today, we have merchant seamen manning our pre-positioned supply fleet in the Indian Ocean, our specialized military sealift command vessels, and our privately owned, deep-draft fleet of merchant vessels. Today, as before, they stand ready to help this Nation in its time of need.

During the last Congress, the subcommittee I chair—the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine—held an oversight hearing on August 13, 1986, on awards and benefits for merchant seamen. The hearing proved quite revealing. Significant contributions of the merchant marine during World War II were highlighted. Many who sailed in "harm's way" were younger or older than draft age. Many who were of draft age were often exempt from military conscription due to their physical condition. Those who were of draft age and physically fit were often not accepted in the service, and were advised to continue employment in the merchant marine due to the extreme shortage of competent merchant seamen. Many of them were essentially under military control, performed wartime responsi-

bilities in combat areas, and were often the target of enemy attack. Many were captured and became prisoners of war for lengthy periods. While sailing, they were not in a reasonable position to resign from duty, nor were they given excessive time ashore between voyages.

In light of what was learned at the hearing, I decided to introduce legislation that is 40 years overdue. The centerpiece of my legislation is to provide benefits—primarily health and hospitalization benefits—to those merchant seamen who served on merchant vessels during the period of hostilities from December 7, 1941, through August 15, 1945. This includes service as a civilian or civil service member of the merchant marine on vessels of the United States on an ocean, coastwise, or intercoastal voyage.

To qualify, a merchant seaman must have sailed for a total period equal to at least 12 months during the 45 months of hostilities. This service must be verifiable by entries noted in a continuous discharge book, certificates of discharge, a certificate of substantially continuous service, or other appropriate documentation.

This creditable active duty service for the receipt of benefits would also include time spent as a prisoner of war or civilian internee as the result of enemy action against merchant shipping. Time spent in various maritime or Armed Forces schools would also be included in determination of this service. Those seamen who were disabled or permanently injured as the result of enemy action against merchant shipping would qualify for benefits without regard to the basic 12-months' service requirement. Finally, benefits would not be retroactive but would be available beginning on the date of enactment.

One might ask why, so many years after the termination of World War II, are we interested in this type of legislation. To place things in the proper perspective, one must review a little history. After the war, the issue of benefits was reviewed by the Congress, but no progress was made. This was primarily due to the mistaken assumption that merchant seamen were highly paid for the risks they took in the form of war-zone bonuses. When one does an analysis of pay scales, military dependent allowances, and certain surtax and victory tax exclusions, the actual income after taxes of a merchant seaman and a naval seaman were comparable. This, of course, does not include the benefits a naval seaman received; for example, housing mortgage, educational, and reemployment assistance—to name only a few.

Another inequity was the amount of assistance the dependents of a merchant seaman killed in action received compared to those dependents of a naval guncrew seaman. Merchant seamen dependents received a lump sum payment of \$5,000. Dependents of naval seamen killed in action received 6 months' base pay and an annuity for life, plus coverage for dependent children until age 18—which, in most instances, added up to considerably more. Based on life expectancy tables and the number of dependents, this annuity could be from three to six times as much as a merchant seaman received. The same compensation ratio prevailed for those seamen

who received disabling injuries. I might add that, except for a few senior licensed officers, every merchant seaman aboard a merchant vessel could have earned more money ashore in defense-related work without risking being killed or incapacitated by bombing or torpedo attacks. They chose to accept the risk in the defense of our Nation, and it is about time their Nation recognizes their endeavors.

Some contend that merchant seamen were free to stop sailing whenever they desired and were not subject to the degree of control exercised over a member of the armed services; therefore, they should not be entitled to veterans' status. While this argument appears valid on its face, the realities of manning merchant vessels during the war leads one to a different conclusion.

A merchant seaman was only paid for the time he was attached to a merchant vessel and received no pay between voyages while awaiting assignment to another vessel. When he took a month or so off, he was not paid—while the naval seaman received 30 days of annual leave with pay. It is true that, in some instances, merchant seamen made one or two voyages and then decided to seek safe shore-side employment. My bill recognizes this fact and only provides benefits to those merchant seamen whose actual sailing time—from signing on shipping articles to signing off shipping articles—equals 12 months out of a 45-month period of hostilities.

While the issue of benefits for merchant seamen has been with us for some time, the whole issue was reopened in 1977 with enactment of Public Law 95-202. This law requires the Secretary of Defense (since delegated to the Secretary of the Air Force) to designate as veterans the women's Air Force service pilots [WASPS] and other "Similarly situated groups" if the Secretary finds that the service constituted active military service and the members were discharged honorably.

A recent decision of the Department of Defense civilian/military service review board granting veterans' status to merchant seamen who were requisitioned by the Army to serve on "Blockships" in support of operation "Mulberry" during the landing at Normandy raises questions of fairness and reasonableness. Sunken blockships were a part of the artificial harbors and sunken concrete caissons that provided a sheltered area for tugs, barges, landing craft, and antiaircraft platforms. These artificial harbors were called "mulberries" and were used to discharge enormous amounts of supplies and equipment until a major port facility could be captured. This was a brief, one-time event that provided veterans' status to a very limited number of merchant seamen. It is inconceivable to me that those who served in the merchant marine for a much longer time than it took to complete operation "Mulberry" are, after more than 40 years, still denied veterans' status.

My bill attempts to rectify obvious inequities. It deserves the support of those who believe that it's time to pay tribute to merchant seamen with words and deeds.

THE FAMILY INVESTMENT ACT OF 1987

HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this country's welfare program has been very much in the news of late. Studies have documented its failings; expert groups have put forth strategies for improvement; the Governors have called for reform; the administration has lent its voice to the demands for change. Valid criticism of the welfare system is coming from both ends of the political spectrum, and from those who pay for welfare and from those who receive it.

All of us have our reasons for demanding change in the current system. Mine is that I simply cannot accept taxpayers' dollars being used to create and sustain an underclass in America. But whatever our reasons, we can agree that now is the time to act.

Today, we are taking another step toward making welfare reform a reality. We are introducing the Family Investment Act, a bill that would make fundamental changes, not only in the operation of the welfare system, but in its basic purpose.

The goal of the welfare system must be to get people off welfare and to work. It is as simple as that. The welfare system must enable people to support themselves and their families. It must encourage, not discourage, self-sufficiency. It must strengthen, not weaken, families. It must provide sufficient income so that recipients can focus their efforts on removing themselves from the system. And it must not only equip appropriate recipients with the tools they need to move from welfare to work—it must demand that they use them.

AFDC does not live up to those goals today. It is a compelling indictment of the present system that one of every four children born in this country last year was born poor, even after AFDC benefits were counted in family income. Even considered simply as a poverty program, welfare is not working. But its failures go far beyond that.

Welfare does not work to strengthen families. In many ways—from restricting intact families from receiving AFDC to ignoring the support responsibilities of fathers—welfare actually works to weaken family bonds.

Welfare does not provide for the development of the skills, education, or support needed to create a way out. Particularly for young women, welfare provides bare sustenance, not the education and job training that are avenues to self-sufficiency.

Perhaps most important, welfare does nothing to encourage the dignity and self-respect that are crucial for self-sufficiency. Only infrequently and half-heartedly does it demand that recipients take responsibility for themselves.

These are the problems that beset the welfare system. Welfare should be a two-way street of mutual obligation—the obligation of society to help those in need, and the obligation of those in need to help themselves. But in far too many cases, it provides only a one-

way ticket to permanent dependence and permanent poverty.

The Family Investment Act would restructure welfare to create that two-way street. It would replace AFDC with an entirely new program, designed from the ground up to do what assistance should do. Let me highlight a few key provisions.

First, this bill would require welfare recipients, including single mothers of young children, to participate at least part-time in job training or education or to work. At the same time, it would ensure the child care, transportation, and other services that make work possible. These comprehensive welfare-to-work programs would be designed by the States to meet their clients' needs.

Second, this bill would establish a family living standard, not nationwide, but State by State, to ensure an adequate level of support for those still needing income assistance. The FLS would reflect the costs of basic necessities in each State or area of a State. Welfare benefits would be in the form of "supplements" to existing family income—for example, wages, child support, and pensions.

And third, this bill would place relationships between welfare recipients and welfare workers on a new footing: A contractual footing where obligations and responsibilities on both sides are spelled out clearly, and where sanctions exist if they are not met. I believe this approach will maximize individual responsibility and minimize the long-term dependency we are all so concerned about.

The Family Investment Act makes some very significant departures from welfare as we know it. In this, it builds on the really excellent work done by the American Public Welfare Association, whose thoughtful study of welfare reform, "One Child in Four," has contributed so much to the debate. As a member of the Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee of Ways and Means, I am looking forward not only to continuing this important debate, but to moving a comprehensive welfare reform bill this year.

We are a society of great wealth, yet poverty—even permanent poverty—remains. It is to our credit that, in the past, we have sought solutions to the problem of want in a society of plenty. Yet much of what we have tried so far has not worked, or no longer works. Mere transfers of money are not enough. Neither are lectures about the values of dignity and self-reliance. If the trip from welfare to work is going to be worth taking, hard work must have results and self-reliance must have rewards.

That is what this bill is about. It demands that people make an effort to help themselves, and it promises a real chance for those who do. Thank you very much.

FAIRNESS OF EXCISE TAX INCREASE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 1986, Senator GEORGE MITCHELL of Maine

released a staff working paper prepared by the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] entitled "The Distributional Effects of an Increase in Selected Federal Excise Taxes." The study was prepared at the request of Senator MITCHELL.

The CBO study reviewed the distributional effects, among income classes, of a simulated increase of \$1 billion in gross excise tax revenues from separate increases in the excise tax on seven commodities: beer, wine, liquor, tobacco, gasoline, airfare, and telephone service.

Except for the excise tax on airfares, the study concluded that, "Increases in all other excise taxes would be at least marginally regressive." More to the point, the study also concluded, "An increase in the excise tax on tobacco would be the most regressive of all the taxes considered."

Each year, there are efforts in the House and the other body to increase the Federal excise tax on cigarettes. These efforts are founded in two separate trains of thought. On the one hand, an increase is propounded as a method of raising revenue in order to meet reconciliation requirements. The other hand seeks to substantially decrease the level of sales of cigarettes by making them too expensive for the average consumer. Granted, it is an easy target for a tax increase, but the equity of such legislation is usually ignored by the proponents of an increase.

The CBO study clearly illustrates that excise taxes, and, particularly the excise tax on cigarettes, are extremely regressive. At the current 16-cent level, the tobacco excise tax, as a percent of income, is 15 times higher for low-income—less than \$5,000 per year—families than for high-income—over \$50,000 per year—families. If this were any other commodity, I suspect that an effort to increase the tax burden on our low- and middle-income Americans would not be introduced, much less seriously considered by Congress.

In releasing the report, Senator MITCHELL, who is a member of the Senate Finance Committee, reminded Congress that as we consider revenue options this year, we should be aware of the unfairness of relying on increases in excise taxes. I would urge the review of the CBO study by those who seek to increase excise taxes.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL SEABED HARD MINERALS ACT

HON. MIKE LOWRY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the National Seabed Hard Minerals Act. This bill is identical to H.R. 5464 that I introduced in the 99th Congress. This legislation is necessary because representatives of industry, environmental groups and coastal States have expressed serious misgivings about the adequacy of section 8(k) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act Amendments as a statutory regime for the de-

velopment of hard mineral resources within our Nation's exclusive economic zone [EEZ].

Prior to the introduction of H.R. 5464, a working group comprised of industry representatives, environmental groups and coastal States and convened by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, had been working to develop legislative recommendations. H.R. 5464 was based on many of the recommendations proposed by this working group.

In the last Congress, on June 26, 1986, the Subcommittee on Panama Canal/OCS, which I chaired, held an oversight hearing concerning the adequacy of section 8(k). A second joint hearing on H.R. 5464 was held on September 23, 1986 by the Subcommittee on Oceanography, which I now chair, and the Subcommittee on Panama Canal/OCS. At the second hearing, representatives from industry, coastal States, environmental groups, universities and the working group testified in support of H.R. 5464. However, many of the witnesses did suggest minor changes or modifications.

The fact the bill I am introducing today does not incorporate some of these suggestions and recommendations does not, in any way, indicate that I am not receptive to some of the proposed changes to the legislation.

Rather, because the working group has played such a significant role thus far in developing a consensus about the principle to be incorporated in any legislation, I would like to take the time necessary to consult further with the working group about possible changes in the legislation.

I am eager to work in the 100th Congress with the working group, as well as other interest parties, to develop a forward-looking bill, based on as much consensus as possible, to be enacted into law.

To that end I welcome suggestions from my colleagues and others, including those from within the administration, who see the need for more comprehensive statutory authority than that provided under section 8(k) of the OCS Lands Act.

MEDICARE CATASTROPHIC ILLNESS COVERAGE ACT

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished Republican leader, Mr. MICHEL, and several of my colleagues as an original cosponsor of the Medicare Catastrophic Illness Coverage Act. This legislation, which has been endorsed by the administration, will provide comprehensive acute health care coverage to Medicare beneficiaries after they have paid \$2,000 in out-of-pocket expenses. With a nominal increase in the Medicare part B premium, a significant number of elderly will be freed from the severe financial risks that accompany even minimal hospitalization. I applaud the Department of Health and Human Services and its distinguished leader, Secretary Bowen, in developing this thoughtful legislation.

In the months ahead, as we scrutinize this legislation more thoroughly, we will have to

keep in mind what lessons we have learned during the Medicare program's 22-year growth and what the demographers tell us about age patterns in the future. When Medicare was established in the mid-1960's, we perceived ourselves as a nation of virtually unlimited Federal resources. We have been humbled in recent years as it has become apparent that the limits of Federal spending are not boundless. The legislation I am cosponsoring today has a number of safeguards built into it to prevent the Federal Government from paying huge sums of money out of general revenues for catastrophic health services. But we will have to assure that those safeguards remain in place, especially if we recognize that the segment of the population that will grow at the fastest rate in the next decades is the segment above the age of 65.

As the ranking minority member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, to which this legislation is likely to be referred, I will make every effort to insure that the legislation that emerges from that committee responsibly addresses the catastrophic health care needs of the elderly.

CITRUS/PASTA AGREEMENT

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would implement the United States/EEC Citrus/Pasta Agreement concluded on August 10, 1986, after intense and difficult negotiations between U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter and EEC External Relations Commissioner Willy De Clercq.

The agreement brings to a close the citrus/pasta dispute that was pending for some 16 years. Let me briefly describe the history of this longstanding dispute for those of you who are not familiar with the so-called pasta war.

The dispute began in 1969 over the EEC's practice of granting preferential tariff rates to citrus and citrus product imports from certain Mediterranean countries—a practice that was widely acknowledged to violate the most-favored-nation principle of the GATT. After years of unsuccessful bilateral negotiations, the United States brought the matter to GATT dispute settlement, where a judgment was rendered confirming that U.S. rights had been violated. Because the EEC continued to resist corrective action, the United States retaliated against Europe in November 1985 by raising the tariff on imports of EEC pasta. Without international support or justification, the EEC counterretaliated with higher tariffs on U.S. walnuts and lemons.

Finally, an agreement was reached on the citrus dispute. Both the United States and the EEC have agreed that the retaliatory tariffs placed on pasta, lemons and walnuts will be reduced to prereretiation rates. More significantly the EEC has agreed to grant most-favored-nation tariff reductions on fresh oranges, fresh lemons, mineolas, grapefruit, and frozen concentrated orange juice. Additionally, both sides have committed to a

number of trade liberalizing measures on a range of agricultural items. The United States will receive a substantial tariff reduction on almonds as well as tariff liberalization on peanuts, in exchange for which modest relief has been granted on certain EEC items, including satsuma oranges, non-California style olives, capers, cider, paprika, and certain other products. In addition, the EEC's cheese quota for certain Italian cheese will be slightly reduced.

In announcing the accord, Ambassador Yeutter heralded the package as meaningful and expressed his belief that it "augurs well for the future of U.S./EEC trade relations." He has made it clear that the agreement represents the best possible settlement that could have been achieved under the circumstance. Although we would have liked a clear cut victory in this case it seems clear that reopening the dispute would likely not produce any further gains.

At a time when the new trade round is beginning to get underway, I strongly believe that we in Congress need to let the international trading world know that when our principal trade negotiator reaches an accord that he believes is the best possible result, he will have all the congressional support he needs to see it effectuated. If we do not demonstrate such support, it will handicap the U.S. Trade Representative's subsequent ability in international circles to negotiate trade agreements on behalf of our industries. With protectionist measures flourishing worldwide, we can ill-afford to limit our negotiating strength.

Under the terms of the accord, U.S. congressional authorizing legislation must be enacted by July 1, 1987, or the agreement may be terminated. I, accordingly, ask all of my colleagues to line up behind this measure and see to it that it is expeditiously passed. It is a package which does provide some benefits to the U.S. exports, and one that should not be allowed to die of congressional inertia.

H.R. 1263

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

SECTION 1. PURPOSE: AMENDMENTS.

(a) The purpose of this Act is to enact the trade liberalization measures agreed to by the United States in connection with the United States-European Communities Agreement on Citrus and Pasta.

(b) Whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a schedule, headnote, item, or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a schedule, headnote, item, or other provision of the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

SEC. 2. ANCHOVIES.

Subpart C of part 3 schedule 1 is amended by striking out item 112.40 and inserting in lieu thereof the following items with a superior heading having the same degree of indentation as item 112.42:

Fish, prepared or preserved in any manner, in oil, in airtight containers:			
Anchovies:			
112.39	If entered in any calendar year before 3,000 metric tons of anchovies have been entered under this item in such calendar year.	3%	ad val.
112.41	Other.....	6%	ad val.

SEC. 3. CHEESE.

(a) Suitable for Grating.—Item 117.65 is amended by striking out "9% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "Free".

(b) Pecorino.—Item 117.67 is amended by striking out "12% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "Free".

SEC. 4. SATSUMA ORANGES.

Subpart B of part 9 of Schedule 1 is amended by inserting ahead of item 147.29 item 147.28 with a superior heading having the same degree of indentation as item 147.30:

Oranges:		
147.28	Mandarin, packed in airtight containers: 40,000 metric tons of Satsuma oranges have been entered under this item in such calendar year.	Free
147.29	Other.....	0.2¢ per lb.

SEC. 5. OLIVES.

Subpart B of part 9 of Schedule 1 is amended as follows:

Olives, fresh, or prepared or preserved: in brine, whether or not pitted or stuffed. Not ripe and not pitted or stuffed: Not green in color and not packed in airtight containers of glass, metal, or glass and metal.		
148.43	Other: Green in color and in containers of 3 gallons or more to be used for repacking or sale as green olives, in a quantity not to exceed 1,600,000 gallons annually.....	10¢ per gal.
148.45	Other.....	20¢ per gal.
20	In containers each holding not more than 0.3 gallon.	20¢ per gal.
40	In containers each holding not more than 0.3 gallon.	20¢ per gal.
Ripe, but not pitted or stuffed: Not green in color and not packed in airtight containers of glass, metal, or glass and metal.		
148.47	Green in color and in containers of 5 gallons or less each, in a quantity not to exceed 247,500 gallons annually.	15¢ per gal.
148.49	Other.....	30¢ per gal.
Pitted or stuffed:		
148.50	Pitted.....	30¢ per gal.
20	In containers each holding not more than 0.3 gallon.	
40	In containers each holding not more than 0.3 gallon.	
148.51	Stuffed: Placed packed in containers each hold- ing not more than 0.3 gallon in a quantity not to exceed 915,507 gallons annually.....	15¢ per gal.
148.53	Other.....	30¢ per gal.
20	In containers each holding not more than 0.3 gallon.	
40	In containers each holding more than 0.3 gallon.	
148.55	Dried: Not ripe.....	2.5¢ per lb.
148.57	Ripe.....	
148.58	Otherwise prepared or preserved: Green in color and in containers of 5 gallons or less each, in a quantity not to exceed 1,212,000 lbs. annually.....	2.5¢ per lb.
148.59	Other.....	5¢ per lb.

SEC. 6. CAPERS.

Items 161.06 and 161.08 are each amended by striking out "16% ad val." and inserting in lieu thereof "8% ad val.".

SEC. 7. PAPRIKA.

Item 161.71 is amended by striking out "2.4¢ per lb." and inserting in lieu thereof "1.35¢ per lb.".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SEC. 8. CIDER.

Item 167.15 is amended by striking out "3¢ per gal." and inserting in lieu thereof "1.5¢ per gal.".

SEC. 9. OLIVE OIL.

(a) IN CONTAINERS.—Item 176.29 is amended by striking out "3.8¢ per lb. on contents and container" and inserting in lieu thereof "2.28¢ per lb. on contents and container."

(b) OTHERS.—Item 176.30 is amended by striking out "2.6¢ per lb. and inserting in lieu thereof "1.56¢ per lb.".

SEC. 10. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered or withdrawn from warehouses for consumption on or after the date that is 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE PRESIDENT'S
COMPETITIVENESS INITIATIVE

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, the President has sent to Congress his competitiveness package, the Trade, Employment, and Productivity Act. It clearly is a far-reaching, balanced proposal that should be enacted by this Congress. When 75 percent of U.S. goods face competition from abroad, our challenge is to do whatever we can to make American firms more competitive worldwide. One way we can do this is by changing antiquated law that impedes efficiency. It is in this light that I am particularly heartened to see the administration's antitrust reforms, first proposed last year, included in the package. The antitrust laws were written in a time dominated by domestic competition in isolated markets, not international competition in world markets. The world has changed dramatically since that time, and our laws should reflect that change. I realize that adjusting the antitrust laws to reflect foreign competition is only one of many steps we must take to improve our international competitiveness, but it is an important one. Taking that step, along with other elements of the President's package—education reforms, enhanced science and technology programs, better protection of intellectual property, streamlined export controls, and improved trade laws—will help greatly as we attempt to deal rationally in our complex, interdependent global economy.

RICHARD CHARLES WALKER
EAGLE SCOUT

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, February 28, 1987, will be remembered as a very special day in the life of one young man from my district. Richard Charles Walker, son of Donald and Janet Walker of Harrisburg, PA, has earned Boy Scouts' highest award—the Eagle Scout, which he will receive before family, friends, and his Congressman at an

Eagle Recognition Banquet at Colonial Park United Church of Christ.

Richard, a member of troop 302 of St. Marks Lutheran Church, Colonial Park, and a freshman at Central Dauphin East Junior High School, earned the distinguished Eagle Award after locating, planning, and installing a 2,800-foot nature trail in Lower Paxton Township. Richard's project included identifying plants, trees, and habitats and installing identification signs along the trail. Richard's nature trail has since been named the Oscar Lingle Nature Trail.

As a member of troop 302, Richard has held several leadership positions including quartermaster, assistant patrol leader, and den chief. He presently serves as his troop's senior patrol leader. He is a brotherhood member of the Order of the Arrow and was a member of the junior leadership training staff last year. Richard has earned 37 merit badges and all 12 skill awards in Boy Scouts.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention Richard's participation in the All-American Soap Box Derby since it was through the yearly soap box competitions, which I attended in Harrisburg, that I became acquainted with Richard and his family.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in congratulating Richard on this very special occasion. I wish him great success in his future endeavors.

DRUG EDUCATION ASSEMBLY
AND PARADE

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's war against drugs begins in our homes and in our communities.

The pupils and teachers of North Glade Elementary School of Opa Locka, FL, in the Dade County portion of my district, understand this crucial step in the efforts to halt our country's drug crisis. On March 2, 1987, North Glade Elementary will be holding a "Say No To Crack" assembly and parade. The fifth and sixth grade students from North County, Palm Springs North, and Lake Stevens Elementaries also will be participating in these activities. This event kicks off the school's observance of Drug Prevention Month.

As chairman of the House Task Force on International Narcotics Control and as a member of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I wish to commend North Glade Elementary, its principal, Herbert L. Day and all the participating schools for their determined efforts to educate students about the dangers of substance abuse.

I also wish the "Say No To Crack" assembly and parade every success and urge the participants to keep up the excellent work.

THE PHILIPPINES CELEBRATES DEMOCRACY

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the people of the Philippines as they celebrate the first anniversary of their country's return to democracy today.

One year ago, President Marcos rigged his election to prolong his repressive rule. And 1 year ago, in an amazing 4-day series of events, the people of the Philippines took to the streets, stopped Marcos' tanks, and elected Corazon Aquino.

President Aquino's remarkable determination to restore justice and democracy to the Philippines against overwhelming odds produced a "people-power revolution that thrilled the world.

But democracy has not come easy. Many years of corruption had produced a government that served the few, a crumbling economy, and widespread poverty, all of which fueled a growing Communist insurgency. Under immense pressure for immediate solutions, President Aquino has worked quickly to restore the economy and rebuild the democratic institutions while maintaining an unwavering commitment to peace and human rights. Above all, she began the difficult challenge of creating a new Philippine constitution.

Since September, when she came to our country and delivered an address that we will all long remember, President Aquino has faced one crisis after another. Dissension among her advisers, coup attempts, and a fragile cease-fire agreement with the Communist rebels have threatened to destabilize the Government. But she refused to let go of the people's mandate and has managed each crisis in turn. Just this month, in a remarkable testament to their commitment to democracy and to President Aquino's courageous leadership, the people of the Philippines turned out in record number to support overwhelmingly the new constitution.

Parades, music, and fireworks displays will mark the anniversary festivities today. With a new democratic political system committed to the well-being of all the people and a constitution that will provide a lasting structure for peace and stability, Filipinos have a lot to celebrate.

WILDLIFE ACTION, INC.

HON. ROBIN TALLON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 705, a measure to recognize Wildlife Action, Inc., a nonprofit organization for wildlife conservation based in South Carolina. Since its inception in 1977, this worthy organization has struggled to make the public aware of the price of unnecessary development and construction without wise consideration of adverse effects on the environment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Under the direction of its president, Gault Beason, Wildlife Action has taken an active, responsible role in meeting conservation challenges and protecting our living resources. WLA's simple yet vital goal is "to put back more than we take." It is this critical message of conservation and appreciation that members of WLA have worked so diligently to communicate.

Through events, meetings, forums, outings, and mailings, WLA has brought home the importance of respect for our natural resources. Whether it is WLA's archery competition, bird-watching day or "Wildlife Pride," its monthly conservation publication for sportsmen, WLA is actively and innovatively raising public awareness of the importance of environmental preservation.

Through its activities WLA promotes sportsmen education programs which emphasize safety, responsibility, and respect for laws and the rights of others. Respect, after all, is the bottom line: Respect for our wildlife heritage and the importance of our natural wealth for future generations.

One of South Carolina's greatest challenges for the future is the careful and long-term management of her coastal resources. Although it is difficult to think of the enduring environmental consequences of development when given the immediate economic benefits that accompany coastal development; it is far more costly in the long term not to. The failure of development to factor in environmental concerns has already resulted in the permanent destruction of wetlands all along our coasts. However, through the work of WLA and other such organizations, I believe we can better achieve a healthy balance between the forces of nature and development.

Wildlife Action has brought to many South Carolinians a new awareness and enjoyment of our environment's unique beauty and delicate balance. I think its five-point creed says it best: Preservation, conservation, education, sportsmanship, and fellowship. Wildlife Action will leave a fine legacy of wildlife preservation and conservation. I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this measure to grant Wildlife Action the charter that it needs and deserves.

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUES

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the people of Lithuania in their quest for democracy. As I stand before you today, the Soviet Union continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, as they have for the past 47 years.

Recently, supporters of a free and independent Lithuania celebrated their 69th Independence Day. This celebration has come to symbolize the aspirations of Lithuanians throughout the world, that one day they will be free. I am pleased to note that the United States and most of our European allies have refused to recognize the illegal Soviet acquisition of this country.

February 25, 1987

I would also like to express my deep respect and admiration for the Lithuanian people. During the current Soviet occupation, nearly 350,000 people have been imprisoned for trying to express their political and religious rights. This has not hindered, however, the Lithuanians desire for independence. These friends of democracy have continued to oppose Soviet rule, despite the constant threat of reprisal. As recently as 1972, 17,000 Lithuanians signed a petition to the United Nations requesting help in restoring religious freedom. Also, the Lithuanian underground has produced more publications than any other country in the Eastern bloc. I welcome the day when Lithuania will once again rejoin the ranks of the Democratic nations.

In closing, I would once more like to congratulate all Lithuanians, whether at home or in exile, on their 69th anniversary. You truly are an inspiration to the world.

KOREA, WELCOME BACK TO AMERICA'S HEARTLAND

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row, a delegation of Korean agribusinessmen will be in the United States to publicly announce purchases of corn, wheat, and soybeans totaling \$110 million. From February 14 until February 23, this Korean buying mission will visit six States, including Illinois.

South Korea is the fourth largest consumer of United States agricultural goods. In 1986, Korea imported from the United States 85 percent of its wheat, 85-90 percent of its soybeans, and approximately 35 percent of its corn. In total, South Korea spent over \$1 billion for United States agricultural products last year. This figure represents approximately one-sixth of Korea's total imports from the United States in 1986.

As the No. 1 agricultural exporting State in the United States, Illinois welcomes the Korean delegation. Illinois farmers are very proud of the products they grow. There is no higher compliment for Illinois agriculture than for this Korean delegation to travel halfway around the world to "Buy American."

For many years, South Korea has been one of America's largest agricultural importers. The upcoming Korean agricultural buying mission reaffirms the historically strong ties between both countries in agricultural trade. Korea, welcome back to America's heartland.

MINNESOTA TRUCK COMPANY WINS NATIONAL SAFETY AWARD

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, as a former participant in the motor carrier industry, I am proud to note that Schanno Transportation,

Inc., of West St. Paul, MN, will be awarded the grand prize award in the annual Interstate Carriers Conference fleet safety contest.

The Interstate Carriers Conference is made up of about 600 common and contract trucking companies nationwide, and is affiliated with the American Trucking Association.

The award will be presented to Mr. Reginald M. Norris, Jr., president of Schanno Transportation and Mr. Ronald V. Hein, vice president of safety and loss prevention, at the conference's annual meeting in March. Schanno also won divisional honors based on annual miles driven—over 30 million miles in 1986.

I know from personal experience that an award-winning safety record requires painstaking efforts by every person associated with the company. Safety does not just happen. It can be achieved. Schanno Transportation, its management, and all its employees, especially its drivers, are to be congratulated for their premier safety record and for the national recognition it has received.

CATASTROPHIC HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. BOB WHITTAKER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1987

Mr. WHITTAKER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, I'm pleased to be able to join my colleagues today in introducing legislation which, in the President's words, will provide "peace of mind" for 30 million elderly. This legislation, which will shield our elderly from acute care expenses, is long overdue.

When catastrophic illness strikes, it is indeed a real human tragedy. However, in many instances, the tragedy doesn't end when the loved one recovers from their illness. The catastrophe of high and seemingly unending medical bills due to gaps in Medicare coverage can go on for several generations, thus burdening sons, daughters, and grandchildren.

The package we are introducing today will provide catastrophic health insurance by setting an out-of-pocket cap of \$2,000 for the amount of services currently covered by Medicare. This additional coverage will be financed through a minimal addition to the Medicare part B premium. This is accomplished by utilizing the existing Medicare structure: No new bureaucracy; no new redtape.

For some time now, those 30 million who benefit from Medicare are finding that this program is inadequate when it comes to providing catastrophic coverage. Designed to ease the financial burden of our Nation's elderly, we are finding that 1.3 million Medicare eligible Americans annually have out-of-pocket expenses which exceed \$2,000 per year.

As a group, the elderly are vulnerable enough without the added insecurity and terror of going broke due to the high medical expenses which can accrue due to a severe and unforeseen illness.

As a Member of Congress and one concerned about the health and well-being of the

American people, I believe that we must move forward with this much-needed package to free our elderly from burdensome acute care costs.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 26, 1987, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 27

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Office of Consumer Affairs, and the Consumer Information Center.

SD-124

Finance

International Trade Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative and the U.S. International Trade Commission.

SD-215

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Administrative Conference of the United States, U.S. Tax Court, Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped, Merit Systems Protection Board, Office of the Special Counsel, Advisory Committee on Federal Pay, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

SD-116

Finance

Social Security and Family Policy Subcommittee

To resume hearings on how to improve the existing family welfare system and

how to promote the well-being of families with children.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Cooperative Service, Packers and Stockyards Administration, and the Office of Transportation.

SD-138

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the Office for Human Development Services, and the Health Care Financing Administration.

SD-116

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative priorities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Lower Mississippi Valley Division, and the New England Division.

SD-192

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for housing and community development programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Agriculture.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the national space transportation program and policy.

SR-253

Judiciary

To resume hearings to review the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Justice, focusing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor.

SD-430

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Legislative Branch Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, Senate Sergeant at Arms and Door-

keeper, and the Office of Technology Assessment. SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Gallery of Art, Commission of Fine Arts, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. SD-192

Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the General Accounting Office, and the Railroad Accounting Principles Board. SD-138

Judiciary
Technology and the Law Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 442, Semiconductor Chip Protection Act Extension of 1987. SD-226

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Physician Payment Review Commission, Commission on Education of the Deaf, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, National Council on the Handicapped, Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, and the U.S. Institute of Peace. SD-124

MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Defense. SD-192

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the Office of Assistant Secretary for Health, and the Centers for Disease Control. SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To resume oversight hearings on corporate takeovers. SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1988 for the National Transportation Safety Board. SR-253

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on available and emerging technologies for the control of precursors of acid rain. SD-406

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Extension Service, Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service. SD-138

Judiciary
To continue hearings to review the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Justice. SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on activities of the Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor. SD-430

1:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness, Sustainability and Support Subcommittee
To hold open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of Defense, focusing on readiness and sustainability posture of U.S. forces. SR-222

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, Naval Petroleum Reserve, and the Office of Emergency Preparedness. SD-192

Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Library of Congress, and the Congressional Research Service. SD-366

MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, and the Health Resources and Services Administration. SD-116

Armed Services
Readiness, Sustainability and Support Subcommittee
To continue open and closed hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 for the Department of Defense, focusing on readiness and sustainability posture of U.S. forces. SR-222

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on how the international spread of nuclear weapons affects specific U.S. national security interests. SD-342

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 2, S. 50, S. 179, and S. 207, bills to provide for spend-

ing limits and public financing for Senate general elections. SR-301

Small Business
Rural Economy and Family Farming Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine new perspectives on rural economy. SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Architect of the Capitol, Copyright Royalty Tribunal, and the Bio-Medical Ethics Board. RD-628

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs focusing on the North Atlantic Division, and the Pacific Ocean Division. SD-192

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Commerce. S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Railroad Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (AMTRAK). SD-138

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation relating to Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation recapitalization, emergency bank acquisitions, nonbank banks, securities powers for bank holding companies, and bank check holds. SD-538

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. SD-430

1:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury. SD-116

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Legislative Branch Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Government Printing Office, Congressional Budget Office, Black Employees of the Library of Congress, and the Ethnic Employees of the Library of Congress.

SD-628

MARCH 6

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Treasury, on behalf of funds for the Financial Management Service, Bureau of the Public Debt, U.S. Mint, and the Internal Revenue Service.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Consumer Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1988 for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

SR-253

10:15 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Veterans Administration.

SD-124

MARCH 9

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the General Services Administration, National Archives and Records Administration, and the Executive Office of the President.

SD-116

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research Service.

SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources

Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on uranium mining, reclamation, and enrichment.

SD-366

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the National Institutes of Health.

SD-138

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of Management and Budget, and the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.

SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for foreign assistance programs.

SD-419

Labor and Human Resources

Employment and Productivity Subcommittee

Labor Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings on the status of dislocated workers as a result of plant closings.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

MARCH 11

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the Social Security Administration, and the Family Support Administration.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume oversight hearings on the world oil outlook.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Farmers Home Administration.

SD-138

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the Marine Mammal Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on catastrophic health insurance.

SD-430

MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Health and Human Services, focusing on the Office of the Secretary, Departmental Management, Office for Civil Rights, Policy Research, and the Office of Inspector General.

SD-116

Energy and Natural Resources

Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 85, to repeal the end use constraints on natural gas and to repeal the incremental policy requirements.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for certain international organizations and programs, and certain activities of the Agency for International Development.

S-128, Capitol

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Science Foundation.

SD-124

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Appalachian Regional Commission.

SD-192

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Panama Canal Commission, and the National Transportation Safety Board.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of Indian Education.

SD-192

MARCH 13

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources

Research and Development Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on uranium mining, reclamation, and enrichment.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology.

SD-124

MARCH 16

10:00 a.m.

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

2175 Rayburn Building

Labor and Human Resources

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Education and Labor's Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

2175 Rayburn Building

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on reclamation programs of the Department of the Interior.

SD-192

MARCH 17

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service.

SD-138

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for certain activities of the Agency for International Development.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1988 for the National Bureau of Standards, Office of Productivity, Technology and Innovation, and the National Technical Information Service, all of the Department of Commerce.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy

conservation, and the National Capital
Planning Commission.

SD-192

MARCH 18

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending
calendar business.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary,
and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

To hold hearings on the uninsured
worker.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on solar and renewables, energy research, and environment.

SD-138

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management
Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Independent Counsel Act.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Agricultural Marketing Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, and the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

SD-124

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for certain activities of the Agency for International Development.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Highway Administration, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.

SD-192

MARCH 20

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General
Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the National Treasury Employees Union.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD-124

MARCH 23

10:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General
Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of Personnel Management, and the Federal Election Commission.

SD-116

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

SD-138

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Power Marketing Administration.

SD-192

MARCH 24

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for certain activities of the Agency for International Development.

SD-126, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee
To hold hearings on overfunding and underfunding on pensions.

SD-430

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Research and Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review the current status of renewable energy technologies.

SD-366

MARCH 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Rural Electrification Administration.

SD-138

Appropriations
 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of State.

S-146, Capitol

Labor and Human Resources
 To hold hearings on children's health care policy.

SD-430

MARCH 26

9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment
 The Board, to meet to consider pending business.

Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Foreign Operations Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Peace Corps, African Development Foundation, and the Inter-American Foundation.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-124

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Federal Energy Regulatory Administration, and the Nuclear Regulatory Administration.

SD-192

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Inspector General, Department of Transportation

SD-138

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
 Research and Development Subcommittee
 To resume hearings to review the current status of renewable energy technologies.

SD-366

MARCH 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality.

SD-124

MARCH 30

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

MARCH 31

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, in behalf of funds for the Foreign Agricultural Service, Food for Peace Program (Public Law 480), and the Office of International Cooperation and Development.

SD-138

Appropriations
 Foreign Operations Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for migration and refugee assistance, U.S. emergency refugee assistance fund, international narcotics control, and anti-terrorism assistance.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 1

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
 To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative priorities of AMVETS, Vietnam Veterans of America, and the Jewish War Veterans.

334 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the De-

partment of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-124

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Appropriations
 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for international organizations of the Department of State.

S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
 Research and Development Subcommittee
 To hold oversight hearings on the clean coal technology program.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
 HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-124

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Appropriations
 Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and the Architectural Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
 Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation Commission.

SD-138

Appropriations
 Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

APRIL 3

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the United States Postal Service.

SD-116

APRIL 6

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 7

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 8

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on nuclear fission, uranium enrichment, and the nuclear waste management.

SD-192

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimate for fiscal year 1988 for the Small Business Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission.

S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

APRIL 9

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on clean coal technology program.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Na-

tional Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Research and Special Programs Administration of the Department of Transportation.

SD-138

1:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Energy Information Administration and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.

SD-192

APRIL 10

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Treasury, U.S. Postal Service, and general government.

SD-192

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-124

APRIL 21

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

APRIL 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Education, focusing on the Office of the Secretary, and salaries and expenses.

SD-192

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Justice, focusing on the Office of the Attorney General, Immi-

gration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System.

S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.

SD-192

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on the Department of Energy national laboratories.

SD-116

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Education, focusing on compensatory education for the disadvantaged, special programs, impact aid, bilingual education, immigrant and refugee education, education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research, special institutions (includes American Printing House for the Blind, National Technical Institute for the Deaf, and Gallaudet College), and vocational and adult education.

SD-192

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development programs, focusing on Atomic Energy Defense activities.

SD-116

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Interior, focusing on the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Education, focusing on student financial assistance, guaranteed student loans, higher education, higher education facilities loans and insurance, college housing loans,

Howard University, education research and statistics, and libraries.

SD-138

APRIL 24

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, and the National Institute of Building Sciences.

SD-124

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for energy and water development, focusing on certain activities of the Department of Energy.

SD-192

APRIL 28

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for security assistance programs.

S-126, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Interior, focusing on the Bureau of Mines, and the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement.

SD-192

APRIL 29

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Justice, focusing on the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, and the U.S. Marshals Service.

S-146, Capitol

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Interior, focusing on territorial governments.

SD-192

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for defense security assistance programs.

S-126, Capitol

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Urban Mass Transit Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of the Interior, focusing on territorial affairs.

SD-192

MAY 4

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-192

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Smithsonian Institution, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, and the Holocaust Memorial Council.

SD-138

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Supreme Court of the United States, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Commission on Civil Rights.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Aviation Administration of the Department of Transportation, and the General Accounting Office (FAA Operations).

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 7

9:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for fossil energy, and clean coal technology programs.

SD-192

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Federal Aviation Administration, and the General Accounting Office (R, E&D, F&E, Airport Grants).

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-116

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies.

SD-192

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the De-

partment of Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.

SD-124

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and related agencies

SD-192

MAY 12

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for certain export financing programs.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Legal Services Corporation.

S-146, Capitol

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for foreign assistance programs.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.

SD-138

MAY 14

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.

SD-138

MAY 15

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.

SD-124

MAY 20

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Judicial Conference, Commission on the Bicentennial of the Constitution, U.S. Sentencing Commission, and the State Justice Institute.

S-146, Capitol

JUNE 23

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Foreign Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings to review proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for the Department of State.

SD-192

CANCELLATIONS

FEBRUARY 26

3:00 p.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee

To resume hearings on proposed authorizations of housing and community development programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Agriculture.

SD-538

FEBRUARY 27

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1988 for ACTION, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, National Mediation Board, National Labor Relations Board, and the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission.

SD-192

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings to review the Department of the Interior's proposed 5-year Outer Continental Shelf leasing plan.

SD-366